SELECTED INTERVIEWS ON THE FUTURE OF DOWNTOWN VANCOUVER

JANUARY 1989

Vancouver City Planning Commission (VCPC) City of Vancouver Planning Department

90-03100/

SELECTED INTERVIEWS ON THE FUTURE OF DOWNTOWN

INTRODUCTION

During the summer of 1988, the Planning Department in cooperation with the Planning Commission, conducted twenty individual interviews with people representing a range of experience, expertise, and insights on the future of downtown. These interviews were an important part of the ideas- and issues-generating phase of the Planning Department's Central Area Plan review and the Planning Commission's Futures report.

The interviews were intended to supplement our other forms of public input. We included people from a cross-section of points of view: academics, architects, businesspeople, artists, community activists. We compiled our list by thinking broadly of various perspectives on downtown; thus, for example, we included members of the Board of the YWCA because of its reputation for social action regarding women's needs. Everyone's list of "experts" would be somewhat different. Only time has prevented us from talking to a yet more complete list of individuals with insights into the downtown's future.

As background for each interview, we posed several questions:

- In your view, how has Vancouver's downtown changed over the past fifteen years?
- In your interpretation of the current trends, what might happen in the next twenty years?
- In terms of values and aspirations, what should happen in the next twenty years?
- What can the community and what can the City do to ensure that what occurs in the next twenty years reflects our ideas of what should happen?

These set the stage for free-flowing conversations. We sought and were given fact, opinion, visions, ideas, and observations on a variety of topics important to the future of downtown.

All of these people gave very generously of their time for which we thank them. In addition, they also agreed to review the transcript excerpts we prepared, culminating in this booklet containing selected verbatim sections of these interviews rich in detail and ideas.

INTERVIEWEES

Page

ACADEMIC/URBAN ECONOMY

Mr. Richard Allen, Chief Economist
B.C. Central Credit Union 1

Mr. David Baxter, Principal
Urban Pacific Financial Corporation 7

Dr. Michael Golderg, Professor
Faculty of Commerce & Business Adiministration
University of British Columbia.....15

Dr. Walter Hardwick, Professor
Department of Geography
University of British Columbia.....26

Dr. David Hulchanski, Director of Centre for
Human Settlements. Associate Professor
School of Community and Regional Planning
University of British Columbia.....33

MEDIA

Mr. Denny Boyd, Columnist
Vancouver Sun.....40

ARCHITECTURE/DESIGN/DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Philip Boname, President
Urbanics Consultants Ltd.....43

Mr. Gerald Hamilton, Architect
Hamilton Doyle Kwan Architects.....52

Mr. Paul Merrick, Architect
Paul Merrick Architects Ltd.....57

Ms. Cornelia Oberlander, Landscape Architect.....59

SUBURBAN DIRECTORS OF PLANNING

Mr. Graham Murchie, Director of Planning
Planning Department, Surrey Municipality.....63

BUSINESS

Mr. Larry Bell, Chairman and CEO
B.C. Hydro.....69

Mr. Ron Longstaffe, Senior Vice-president
Lignum Group.....73

Mr. Peter Paul Saunders, Principal
Saunders Investments. Chairman,
Vancouver Society of Business and the Arts.....77

CULTURE/ARTS

Ms. Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker, Former Director
Vancouver Art Gallery.....79

Mr. Terry Power, Sculptor
Artists for an Creative Environment.....88

COMMUNITIES - SOCIAL NEEDS

Mr. Jim Green
Downtown-Eastside Residents
Association.....93

Ms. Barbara Lindsay, Social Planner
Board of Directors, YWCA.....103

Ms. Rita Morin, President of the Board
YWCA. Western Vice-President,
Hay Career Consultants.....106

LAW

The Honourable N.T. Nemetz
Former Chief Justice of B.C.....110

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Richard Allen

WITH: Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE: July 19, 1988

PLACE: B.C. Central Credit Union

- In terms of the direction that people will be taking in the province over the next decade to two decades, it will be away from the goods-producing sector of the economy to the non-goods-producing sector. I prefer to call it non-goods-producing sector rather than the service sector because service sector is so all-encompassing it doesn't mean anything anymore - and I suppose non-goods-producing sector doesn't mean anything except that it's more explicit in that it's all those parts of the economy that are not producing goods, and in the past our province was primarily a goods-producing province. Services were a very, very minor part of our economy. The services were, for the most part, hospitality services, hotels and that sort of thing. We still remained heavily in the goods-producing sector of the economy up until pretty recently. It's only since the advent of increasing technology that we've been able to move away from a heavy concentration in goods-producing into non-goods-producing and that trend will certainly continue.

- I'm not sure I agree with Walter Hardwick. From the general migration and the general population growth numbers, 40,000 (per year to this region) is a very large number. Even in our peak years of in-migration to the Province we had a net inflow of about 41,000; that was for the whole province, and that's peak. If we have population growth as projected now - about 3.3 million by the turn of the century, something like that, 3.3, 3.5 - I think there's no doubt that a good deal of that population growth will be in the urban areas but not necessarily the Vancouver area. Even if you start dispersing the growth around the province then it's difficult to dig up a growth rate of 40,000, so I would tend to go with David Baxter and the rates at the other end.

- I think one of the growth areas that we're looking at are (serving the needs) of our elderly people. When you start looking at where most of the elderly people are they are in Victoria, the Okanagan and the Vancouver area.

Richard Allen

o For those of us who are impatient to see things moving faster, that changeover process to small manufacturing is very, very slow; we're looking at decades of growth rather than years of growth. So if you're talking about the downtown core of Vancouver over the next five years, ten years, you're not going to see a great splurge of manufacturing business; in fact, it's not going to be downtown. The land is too valuable. But generally, the growth in that kind of activity, the manufacturing business, is going to be very slow.

If you look at the overall growth in manufacturing in British Columbia and remove forestry and the mining, you have very, very little manufacturing growth. Some would suggest even negative growth. If you were to take the electronics industry out of that again, what have you got left?

o (Interviewer's question: Is this because of our distance from markets?)

Yes, it's a local market. Look at Japan, for example, exporting all over the world. It absorbs a lot of its own product. It has a domestic base and we don't have that domestic base. You've got to build up a critical mass of manufacturing business. The electronics industry is now starting to catch on because I think we maybe have reached the critical mass and so we should see steady growth over the next little while. But most of our industries haven't.

o Medical doesn't seem to be export oriented. But it employs people. Unfortunately it employs people that we have to pay for out of tax dollars which restricts growth in other areas.

o (Interviewer's question: So what would you think are the main growth sectors for the economy in the future or the near future?)

Certainly it's the non-goods-producing sector and I think that the hospitality/tourist type industry will probably, in the short term, provide the greatest number of opportunities.

Richard Allen

o (Interviewer's question: Tourism is a very low paying industry, isn't it, so our average earnings will drop, will they? I mean, will we become a poorer city?)

Yes, there's a real danger of that. All you've got to do is look at the high wage sectors in British Columbia and where are they and where they've been. One could argue that wages are high in British Columbia because of our natural resources and because we've been able to capture the "economic rents" or the surpluses in the natural resources and achieved high wages as a result of it. But once you get away from that sector, then you start getting into not very high-paying jobs. This is not just British Columbia by the way, it's universal. The goods-producing sector is where the high wages tend to be.

Not necessarily the high salaries for professionals, but the high wages. High worker's wages.

o Low-paid workers don't live downtown, they're going to be living out in the east end, or wherever rents tend to be lowest, which means that the commuting system has to be as good or better than it is now.

o Our resource industries are still very strong but our resource industries have advanced technologically at a faster pace than we have been able to create new industries and new activities to replace the lost jobs. The forest industry has gone from about 120,000 people employed to around 80,000. At the same time, we're producing record levels of output. People talk about growth in the service sector but the real dynamic growth comes from growth of the goods-producing sector, particularly export goods- producing because that generates revenue that can generate whole new industries.

o (Interviewer's question: So you would say that those services that are exported, the business services that have an export component are more wealth producing than the personal services that are concentrated within our own population?)

We talked so much before about locating an (international) banking centre here. An international banking centre is a place where you book loans and book deposits, but it doesn't employ many people, so you don't need any new big buildings downtown. An international financial centre has a whole infrastructure built around it with the lawyers, accountants, brokers - the New York style of infrastructure. You don't get that without a trading centre as well. You've got to have the synergistic relationship between trade and finance.

One doesn't exist without the other. So to suggest that Vancouver can have an international financial centre, without trade to go with it, is nice - I'd love to see it - but unfortunately it's unrealistic.

- The goods-producing sector is not declining in terms of output. Goods consumed around the world have increased so the manufacturing of them must also have increased, from somewhere. But that does not mean that more people are employed.

- To get philosophical, I see real problems developing over the next several decades as fewer and fewer people are required to produce the amount of goods that the world needs. If you have a totally automated plant producing a great deal of goods, that's tremendous, but it's not creating any income for the consumers of those goods. And so a real wealth distribution problem is going to develop over the years. How are we going to redistribute the wealth that's generated by automated goods production?

- Technology displaces workers. What do you do with a guy that's 45-years old, out of work, and has no skills other than chopping down trees? If we had technical industries we could shift him into, I'm not sure that we're prepared or have the facilities to retrain him to shift into such industries.

- Vancouver has a certain attractiveness to footloose technology based industries. It has a stable political environment, pleasant climate, established infrastructure, etc., but so do other areas of North America. Free trade may increase that attractiveness of Vancouver but other factors such as distance to markets must be considered as well.

- Businesses would have to think twice before they located their offices even this far from the downtown core area (in South False Creek). Meeting with business contacts and maintaining the "business network" is much simpler if everyone is located in a relatively small compact area.

Richard Allen

o I think downtown is moving along very well in the direction it should move, into a highly concentrated business centre. Even the quality of the accommodation that's there is improving. Office space, the eating places, the whole downtown environment, with Canada Place, the Daon Building, all are tremendous improvements in the downtown area.

o Regarding low-end market housing possibilities downtown - my question would be - can somebody working at the low-end of the income scale afford to pay for accommodation, where high land cost would preclude inexpensive housing. Or would such housing cater to the middle income "yuppie" group.

o (Interviewer's question So I wonder what Li Ka Shing was thinking when he bought all that land?)

Well, I guess he was thinking long-term, but he made such a good deal that he couldn't miss anyway. I think we'd have done far better if we'd leased the land. If we had leased the land we'd have kept control.

o That's the kind of assumption that gets us into trouble: we assume that the decline in fertility rates must continue. Historically, fertility rates have not remained static but have gone through cycles of robust growth followed by declines.

o I have some reservations as an investor, regarding downtown housing that is catering to that childless group of young executives. I'm not sure if that's a phenomenon that will continue through the lifetime of those buildings.

o Closing schools changes the structure of the neighbourhood. It's part of a whole environment change. Shopping centres, schools and transportation corridors - that's what a neighbourhood is.

o (Interviewer's question: Our public amenity is one of the things that's going for us; and you would agree with that?)

Yes.

Richard Allen

- Providing university education could become another important service industry - providing high quality university education. But you don't develop a top quality university overnight.

- (Interviewer's question: We're beginning to see from talking to people that very high growth is only pie in the sky and that we're just going to soldier on.)

  Richard Allen agrees.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: David Baxter

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : July 7, 1988

PLACE : Office of Urban Pacific Financial Corp.

---

o If we take a small area of Vancouver geographically (5, 6, 10 city blocks) we see dramatic change, but if we take a look at the pattern of land uses in the city, we see almost no change. There has been infilling, greater densities, but the actual pattern of land use is very, very stable.

o In terms of the future, I believe that everything is demographically driven. What we find now is that the values in our society, things that are valued, are changing, not dramatically because everything is glacial; but if you look at the future over the next 20 years, and that is all we can realistically talk about, the things that are going to drive it are basically the number of people between the ages of 40 and 60, which is going to double.

Our cities are going to be characterized by an increasing dominance of the adult population (over 40) and what the adult population values. They value retailing like mad. The highest consumers of retail goods and services are households whose heads are over the age of 40.

o Being of the dominant demographic group, I don't go to the Symphony. It doesn't interest me. I grew up with rock n' roll. Frank Sinatra was carried by people who were into Frank Sinatra when they were young and they carried him forward, but we are carrying the Rolling Stones forward. 45-year old people playing rock 's roll is kind of silly but they are the people that we are familiar with.

If we are going to be spectators, we are probably going to spectate at home. If you are going to spectate, the technology of being passive is so good right now, why spend so much money and inconvenience going to a live concert which is a mass performance when you can spend much less money and have perfection with a sound system.

- What you buy has a lot of service component to it so that shopping stops being going out, grabbing something in a department store - department store sales continue to plunge - that is anonymous and mass marketed. Instead a man will go to a place like Harry Rosen's or Leone's in Sinclair Centre and you get to know the person who is the salesperson and you have conversations with him, etc. Similarly, with going to restaurants.

  People consume service now much more than commodities - it is called the Engels Effect in economics and essentially as you go up the curve, you consume less in the way of basics (people tend to be normative - it is called necessities) and consume more in the way of what people call luxuries. So that down here on the consumption level, you go to Safeway and buy 30 lbs. of potatoes and up here you go to a store that only sells pasta and you buy 200 grams of 5 different kinds of pasta. You are buying starch but it is much more highly refined.

- (Interviewer's question: What about retailing as public life?)

  I think we will see more of it. We are certainly seeing more of it on a very, very small... 2 city block strip (Robson Street). We have to acknowledge a few things. We are an automobile culture. In North America people tend to get in their cars and drive places. I think we have to acknowledge that we are part of a Western society here as opposed to a European society and I use (the word) Western in terms of North American society.

- People here go to Whistler on the weekend. It is part of their life to do that. People in Toronto don't, so they have a much healthier Symphony. There are more people within 2 1/2 hours drive of City Hall (Toronto) than there are in the 4 western provinces of Canada combined. There is simply a critical mass. Metropolitan Vancouver is the 30th metropolitan area in North America, so there are going to be some things we simply can't support in terms of our population base. We have to acknowledge our lifestyle: the kind of culture we have here which is much more outdoorsy - all those tremendous amenities. The Symphony isn't competing with television; it is competing with sailboats, Whistler, squash clubs and all of those things that fill peoples' exceedingly busy lives.

  As people are getting older they are taking their health with them. We are an outdoor culture here in many senses.

David Baxter

- We still have a healthy, very viable Friends of Chamber Music but they have smaller ambitions and smaller overhead than the Symphony's. The Symphony is a very expensive beast. Maybe we will become the early music capital of the universe because there are people here who appreciate that so very, very much and it is something that we have a population base for, to support the best without a lot of money. Symphonies need full houses and that is hard to support.

  I guess as our city grows larger in the metropolitan area, we will reach that critical mass where we can support it. We have to also keep in mind that we are not like Winnipeg which is much smaller than we are but has almost no alternatives. Our Winter alternatives are phenomenal.

- I think shopping and dining out and dining in are going to become very major aspects of life here. This bodes particularly well for the vitality of downtown. It also bodes well for neighbourhood commercial.

- I took a look at every census since 1961 on mobility data: we are becoming, interestingly enough, less mobile than we ever have been in terms of where we live. For every age group it was more likely in '86 that they have been in the same house for 5 years than it was in '76. Seniors are the least mobile of all age groups. The highest mobility is in the 25-35 age group. Once you get out of that, mobility plunges. As you get older, the home becomes a focus of life. First a focus for the rearing of children and people have often confused that and said - once the people stop rearing the children they will move - the empty nesters, etc.

- The data shows that mobility declines as the children leave home. What that means is that people stay in the same neighbourhood much more which means that neighbourhood shopping streets are becoming neighbourhood-oriented. That bodes very, very well for our neighbourhood commercial developments throughout the city.

- We will always have our best shops somewhere in the downtown core. A part of downtown will always have the extremes, the things that there is only a few things that there is only a few thousand people would ever go into. That is Robson Street and the punk shops on Cordova.

David Baxter

- These things compound because once the baby-boom generation gets hooked on retailing, it means everybody gets hooked on it. As the dominant age group, all the marketing is focused on us, so that if you watch television people are no longer perfectly young, they are becoming perfectly not so young. That has an impact on our whole society.

- Consumers can't go more than about 150 feet without a shopping opportunity. So it is really hard to drag them through that space (Robson by Courthouse), but with the activity in that space it entertains them - it will carry them through and Duthie Books always works like an anchor. I see something happening on that corner where Jensens used to be, which is for lease and is low-rise. If that connection can be made, Robson Street will spill into Granville Street.

- You have an enormous amount of office space sitting in the Golden Triangle and people want somewhere to eat. It is really hard to eat downtown. You have to go up to Robson Street. Coming out of the Golden Triangle, Thurlow is a logical street to go up and that is what supports Joe Fortes, Red Robin, Kamei Sushi. Also, that Thurlow is a more intimate street and is more pedestrian-oriented than Burrard.

- The problem with Granville Street is not that it was a mall, but that it has too many theatres in a small area, and theatres kill a street. There is nobody going in and out of them during the day, so there is no spill-over for retailing, there is no spill-over for restaurants or anything. It is a dead space during the day. In the evening there is a line-up, so it kills anybody going into a retail or restaurant space. People don't eat out after going to a movie (they may after going to the Symphony) but people eat popcorn all the way through a movie and so you are not hungry. You get into your car and go home.

  Movie theatres now belong in malls. Having them all there on Granville kills the area around them for retailing.

  People who go to see Rambo III don't shop afterwards and they don't sit in sidewalk cafes drinking capuccinos.

  I am not opposed to having that kind of area; what I am saying is that it has very significant implications for other activities on that street.

David Baxter

- With respect to a suggestion that zoning should be used to restrict the amount of retail development: the best protection of all from over-retailing is people going bankrupt in retail developments because as long as it is restricted, people will always think there is room for more, and I guess what I would do for public policy is not ever try and restrict retail. We won't be able to comprehend the amount of demand for small retail over the next few years.

  I would not encourage Safeway-like uses on Robson, Denman or Davie; I would encourage them on high-volume traffic arterials.

- Changing shopping hours matters. If the only day most people can shop is Saturday, it is going to be suburban shopping. Later-hour shopping means people can now shop in conjunction with work without going to a suburban mall on Saturdays, which benefits downtown because you can say, "Let's stay downtown and shop."

- If you take a look at housing starts, and apartments as a percentage, 1969 was the peak. We built the West End to accommodate the baby-boom. Those units are designed for baby-boomers - they are small square footage. Since 1971, the only thing that has maintained the small square footage apartment market is women who are working. What you find out is that there has been no change in male household headship rates at all and no change in male rental headship rates. Since 1971, all of the growth surprises have been the tremendous, dramatic increase of female household heads (under the age of 40) in rental accommodation. So if you take a look at the number of apartments occupied by females household heads in 1986 as a percentage of all rental units compared to 1971, you go WOW; so that is what has kept those buildings filled - the rental and the small square footage condominium. It is no longer necessary to become part of a couple to exist as a human being: a lot of single women are now moving into the stage of being owners and that is where I see the next big surprise in housing markets coming over the next 15 years.

- Fairview Slopes and this low-rise higher density ownership housing is being occupied by people who are getting older who like urban living - it is people from the West End. What I have to point out is that young people are declining absolutely in number in metropolitan Vancouver, in metropolitan Canada, in North America, so there isn't a big replacement market coming down the tube. The hot market right now isn't in Fairview Slopes. The hot market is for single, detached, ground-oriented - or if you can't get that, duplex, but it is not for attached. That is what people aspire to in North America.

David Baxter

The goal is the single-family detached, or something that feels like the single-family detached, and for somebody who has lived in the West End on the 23rd floor, Fairview Slopes feels like single detached - they are still looking for ground orientation. There are certainly individual and highly successful high-rise towers selling for enormous prices but we are talking about 100, 200, 300 units or maybe even 1,000 units a year. The majority of them are sold to people from off-shore and that is not a market to chase, in my opinion. For developers it is, but for City policy it is such a small issue.

- o I do a lot of business in Hong Kong, I know a lot of people there and they like Vancouver, but they don't want to live here. They are investing here, but they have invested everywhere in the world. People are buying options in case it goes down the tube in 1997 but many more of them are working to make sure it doesn't go down the tube.

- o South Granville will work because it is going to build off the water and building back. That area, being in the neck, has a lot of excitement to it - very close to Granville Island and you are very, very close to the beaches and the parks. Once you start getting around the corner (eastward on North Shore of False Creek) you are very, very close to what? I think it is going to be a long time, and if Marathon gets going on the Harbour, they are going to take a lot of what would have gone there because that is a better location.

- o We don't keep track of the people who move to Palm Springs. I think this region is going to grow less than 2% a year for the next 20 years. It is so political now - immigration means so much politically. The Premier stands up and says our economy must be in great shape because people are moving here from Alberta or something like that, but people are also moving to Alberta.

  (Interviewer: Walter Hardwick was saying it is going to be 4% a year.)

  There is just no basis for that. Why would it do that? I think we will continue to get that 20,000 a year but I don't see anything in terms of the structure of our economy that makes me say it will go to 40,000. I may be missing something, I have looked hard, it is not going to be financial services, although that is going to be our growth industry but we have got a lot of people in financial services already.

David Baxter

- We are going to have our Mr. Jax - so is everybody else. Everywhere has those things but most manufacturing is market-oriented and take a look at where the markets are in North America. Not only are we the 30th largest metropolitan area in North American, we probably have the furthest drive to the next metropolitan area of that top 30.

- I am not trying to throw water on anyone's party, I am just trying to say that, as somebody who has to sell this region everyday to lending institutions in Toronto and they say - so what's the big picture? The big picture is nice, steady, reasonable growth and boy, if we get that we'll be in great shape, but give me one reason other than we, as chauvinists, like this region.

- After Expo 86 a lot of business people said what a fantastic city - great streets, great shopping, we are going to come back here for holidays; we love the Park, we love the cleanliness - that kind of footloose appeal to those people, but that is only one part of their life. We offer, better than anywhere else in the world, a good health care system, a good education system, security, good fire protection, and yet New York grows faster (in terms of number of people) than we do. But there are all sorts of other things that influence economic decisions. I think we should be going after footloose industry, education, research and the health care industry has tremendous potential. I think those 2 areas, as a matter of economic policy, we should be actively pursuing across the whole region.

- We have a perfect 5 year cycle in the office market - downtown space, over the next 20 years just like it was over the last 20 years. Right now we are just coming out of huge over-building and in the next 3 years we are going to see vacancies plunge and rents sky-rocket and everybody is going to go and build an office building and 5 years from now we will be sitting with 18% vacancy.

  (Interviewer: Where is the absorption coming from?)

  Financial services, international business, banking, mortgage, international fund transfers. A lot of business that is done with respect to Alberta is done through Vancouver because the prairies are so small in each area. If somebody is going to have an office they will have it in Vancouver. Loans, life insurance, general insurance, shipping insurance.

David Baxter

- We can't, in this region, build our future on any one huge, single vision of glory because economic growth occurs job by job. You can't go out and say 'hi-tech is where it's at', because everybody says that. What advantages do we have? We can't compete on wages and we never should. One of the stupidest things in the world is to say - Let's pay low wages so we can grow economically. We should be forgetting all about wage policy - it is absolutely irrelevant to economic growth. We can never compete with Taiwan, Korea, Japan, etc. Every time the forest industry fights a wage battle, what we are saying is we want to see how quickly we can compete directly with third world countries.

- City Hall can do a great deal with respect to health, safety, clean cities, well-organized cities, efficient cities. In Vancouver, congestion is not being able to park outside the Bay. Having said that, we have to maintain it. We are doing very well. Throughout the recession we continued to grow, while Calgary, Edmonton and Winnipeg lost population.

- The City of Vancouver is an artificial entity in the context of Metropolitan Vancouver - it shouldn't exist. We have a Ward System where the Ward leaders do not have to work together. We need regional cooperation to get economic growth activities, whatever they are, including financial services. That means a good transportation system, good fire, personal safety and health.

- 99% of the economic growth that occurs in the region, occurs from people who are already here. They are ignored, they are discouraged and yet they probably, if you add them and all of their ilk, bring more money in than a wheel plant will ever bring. They have to use space that is generally in contravention with By-law A, B or C. There are 10 million little engines of growth, not one big one. If we were Detroit, it's a different story. One of Detroit's problems is they have this single engine growth.

- Along with the sister-city business we should look at equal delegations to communities and groups <u>within</u> the region, including the guys that manufacture the light pipes, etc. Let's have an Entrepreneur of the Month and get some press for these guys who are ultimately going to make it for us.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Michael Goldberg

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : August 17, 1988

PLACE : Dr. Goldberg's Home

- If you want a good idea about the city in the year 2000, go to 1900 - it is the best idea we have got. In 1900 we had street cars and now we call it LRT. We had row houses which we now call townhouses, condos, etc. We had this remarkable innovation on shopping streets where you had retail on the first floor and two or three floors of housing above. The only new ideas which I try to harp on is that there aren't a lot of new ideas when it comes to building cities; we have been doing it for 8 or 10,000 years, people have experimented with most of the ideas. So let's go back and pick some winners.

- 40,000 people like the West End. You walk around the West End and the impression you get is that the West End is spacious. It is only in the recent period that the stuff has been pushed down to the street, squashed down to property lines because that is what we told builders in 1975. The density used to be 3.8 in the West End. In 1975, there was a 40% cut in allowable density - combine that with a boom in demand and it is no wonder that house prices go up. Look at what we did - we down-zoned the whole city in the mid 70's. Lo and behold, we ran out of housing supply and that is really what we are facing.

- The reason housing downtown is very attractive is the European metaphor - the people walk in the streets, they sip coffee, and get rained on. There isn't any constituency that is going to fight it. That is going to stop as soon as these buildings get filled up, you bet people are going to say "no more".

- When I got here in 1968 it was a remarkable place because it was a classic city sitting in the wings waiting to happen. In 1968 the only building standing downtown of recent vintage was the Burrard Building which was built in 1964 and that was the downtown skyline. There had been a report done, the worst consulting report I have ever seen, done by Larry Smith and Associates, the shopping centre people in the States. This report had been done in 1964 and it said that the future of downtown office space was minimal. The reason

they reached that conclusion was that downtown office space was largely inhabited by doctors and dentists and with the expansion of VGH and the Broadway corridor, most demand for future office space would be met on Broadway and there wouldn't be much need for a downtown. All you had to do was look at other places in the world - it was obvious that the world's economy was shifting to a service economy which means a lot of downtown office space! I remember in 1958, because I was studying it, that was the first time in the history of the world that any national economy had more than half of its goods and services produced by the service sector.

- o So False Creek, which was heavy industry and useless for the present economy, has been phased out with a different kind of economy. We have got festival retailing which reflects the change in the population. We have got a downtown which is a producer of services and they (offices) are really just service factories. The key is to let the land use change so it can accurately reflect the changes that are required of it. For instance, Sydney, Australia is the capital of Australia; it is not just a financial capital but it is the economic capital of the country. The Sydney City Council was refusing to allow high density offices and housing. The state of New South Wales got so fed up with City Council that it threw it out, put it under receivership and for the last two years Sydney has been run by a three-man tribunal because the state said we cannot allow this to happen. The land use which is a very micro kind of thing, is having big macro consequences. If Sydney can't change, then the Australian economy can't change. We usually don't look at the link, we look at the change from macro world forces down to land use but it also goes the other way and the two have to be in sync somehow.

- o 1968 reflected the city of 1968 that we were acknowledged to be: a producer of raw materials in large quantities. There wasn't much there. The Hotel Vancouver and the Carriage Room at the Dev were the places to eat when people came to town - that was in 1968. That was basically your choice and then if you were really going up-scale, you could go to the William Tell. You look at what has happened today and its remarkable that the downtown core has changed dramatically to reflect the people and the jobs that we have.

- o Davie Street is kind of a lost cause - it is not a particularly interesting street. Denman has changed dramatically, Robson has changed dramatically. Robson Street was a total dump in 1968. Chinatown was a lot more interesting than Robson Street was. In the late 70's and early 80's Robson Street got very interesting. Why?

Michael Goldberg

We had 125,000 people working on one side, 40,000 people living on another side - it is the edge between the two so that the miracle of Robson Street is a whopping big daytime population and high nightime population. You put higher incomes into jobs downtown and into residents downtown, and boom, that is exactly what you get. You don't need magic to make retail areas work. Davie Street somehow gets left out because it does not have a destination at the other end. It is one-sided whereas Robson Street is an edge between two very intense land uses and there is not any reason to go to Davie Street.

- I think Granville Street is going to be the next come-around. I think Granville Street problems are over. I guarantee five years from now we are going to talk about growth control on Granville Street: how the hell do we slow it down. Just look at the housing that is going in right now between the two bridges south of Pacific. In the next three years there are going to be many apartments with high income households who are going to walk to work. There is only one street to go on and that is Granville because there is nothing of interest on Howe or Hornby. So Granville Street now becomes the path to work. There is also housing going in on Homer at the foot of Homer and Pacific, behind the Austin Hotel on Davie and Howe is a big rental unit, and an old-age home just next to it. All these projects are in the process of being completed and it is going to take another year for them to fill up and then there are two or three other very big projects underway right now. All that residential stuff only has one outlet for its shopping and that is Granville Street, so Granville Street is going to change dramatically.

- The one thing Council didn't do, which I suggested they should have done was down-zone Granville Street. Tell the guys who were speculating that not only are you not going to get more zoning, this is all you got and we are going to squish it down, and now all the old hotel buildings can be renovated and some interesting stuff can be done to them. So suddenly they become valuable and we get the benefit of streetscape and some light on the street. I wanted the Mall extended. I think that still may come to pass eventually because there are going to be lots of people living at that end.

- By 1973, the form of what is happening was well defined, so we could already see the present downtown emerging but five years earlier there was nothing here. The economy was extremely strong, we had huge rates of household formation and the place really took off.

Michael Goldberg

- Yes, when it rains it is nice to have underground malls for people to stroll in, but when it stops raining this is really a pretty easy city to get around for most of the winter. Even when it rains it doesn't kill you. You can walk this city and that is the attraction to me, of getting this huge population anchor at the south end of downtown and letting developers build whatever they want as long as it is within some kind of public interest. Those people are going to find that it is a 15-minute walk from Cafe Splash to the Bay. If we had something interesting for them on the street, it would go very quickly. If we get enough of those people, interesting uses will arise on Granville Street.

- We have one experience with high-density in Vancouver which is the most consistently low vacancy rate next to Kerrisdale and that is the West End. It is an urban design issue. You can go up if you create useable stuff at the base. There is a pathological fear of density even though there is absolutely no evidence that density is bad. There has not been a single study that shows that density is bad. When you adjust for income and race, all the density phobia studies collapse. You have got to design it better so that development has to open up opportunities.

- I don't fear density. I think the key with density is how do we do it in such a way that the people who like being stacked up 40 storeys, get stacked up 40 storeys. Generally, seniors are fine being stacked up 40 storeys. They like to be accessible to downtown. For families, we can build West End densities in four-storey buildings and have everybody ground-accessible.

- In 1968 I started working, on the first consulting job I had ever had, for the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore of False Creek and one of the problems we were grappling with was how the hell did you market housing in False Creek because the image of False Creek in 1968 was industrial. In 15 years we have obliterated what False Creek was and that is a dramatic change. That development opened up the possibility of interacting with the waterfront. I see the same thing happening on the north shore of False Creek and on the south shore of Burrard Inlet. The thing that is dramatic here is that we have got all of this water; the Fraser River, False Creek, Burrard Inlet, and we make no use of it. Talk about open space - Burrard Inlet is a rather large piece of open space and if we are clever about it we can have that open space. The same thing with False Creek - it is a reasonably large body of water. If False Creek were a park, it would make a very big piece of grass.

Michael Goldberg

- If developers want to risk their capital and over-build, it is a blessing to the city. The best thing you can do is get developers to glut the market because it ensures an ample supply of appropriate housing. If they build the wrong kind of housing, they learn very quickly and then they will build the right kind of housing. I don't see where that is a concern and I think part of our strategy should be to coax these guys into over-building. Having a constant supply of over-built housing and office space is going to be very important to us in the future because it is going to allow us to continue to attract firms and households.

- (Interviewer's question: How about the low-income worker who is important to the downtown as a service worker?)

  The best way to ensure this housing is to give developers a ridiculous quantity of building rights. If you are going to be given 10,000 to 12,000 housing units to build, common sense says that you can't build all units for yuppies. The yuppie market isn't that big so if you are smart, the first thing you do is say, "Who is going to take 20% of these units off of my hands? CMHC. Let me try immediately to get 20% of these units occupied by social housing." It makes common sense. The regrettable thing about the poor is that they don't have a lot of mobility, and the other thing is that there is a shortage of housing for them. As a result, the poor have to go where the housing is and they are a captive market. Therefore, if you build housing for low-income households, you are instantly going to fill up and these people are going to be pioneers - it is what we did in South False Creek. Again, common sense says 80% is going to be another 9,000 units and you can't market 9,000 units to yuppies so you are going to have to build some for families, seniors, one- and two-person households, empty-nesters where you are going to have more amenities so that kids and grandkids can come and visit. When you have a big supply like that, you have to target all the possible markets because there is too much risk in putting any one market as your dominant market.

- Developers are going to have to get people in so they can rent the retail space and that is why it is great. Let them have retail because they can't rent retail until they get people living in there and until they get enough people in there, they are not going to get enough retailers. There have been a huge number of attempts in the U.S. - what is called "inclusionary zoning" - where you require people to include, in their units, social housing units and it is a mixed success. I think the best way to do it is to so glut the market. Low income households, despite the fact that they are not buying Cadillacs, do buy bread, milk and food and they do create a demand for the other kinds of services that higher income households are going to be looking for too.

Michael Goldberg

- The South Shore False Creek experience suggests, if anything, we didn't think that one through. We were so anti-car and so pro-park and anti-people in False Creek that what we put up was Richmond in the centre of the city. Downtown we had a maximum of one stall per thousand square feet of office space. The problem is that the buildings are cast in stone and the planning mistake lives on and False Creek, despite its success, is a monumental planning mistake in that we didn't carry street-ends through, we isolated development, we created too small a scale in many instances. The whole medical precinct from Broadway south was not included in the False Creek study. How can you isolate the employment base of this community and not see that the two are together? Well, if we thought of it as a functional area, then you would have had a whole bunch of linkages between the Slopes and the Creek.

- Hopefully we have seen that density can be a plus if we are clever about it and that development can provide new opportunities. It provides the opportunity to resurrect Granville Street, to provide much greater walking opportunities in the city, it opens up the Creek to everybody in Vancouver and the same thing with Burrard Inlet and hopefully we will do similar stuff down on the Fraser River as well.

- What we have got (in the mixed use "bonus" office buildings where one floor of residential is provided for in the zoning) is the worst of high-rise living because you have the housing at the top where it is isolated from ground level. All the supposed evils of density are built into those buildings but none of the benefits, which is lots of people.

- The Concord Pacific people have an enormous vested interest in good urban design. The cost to them (of making mistakes) is monumental and I think guidance from the Planning Department, where we can bring together good urban design ideas on how to make density work would really be a plus. They would go for it because it would be in their vested interest.

- Structural shifts that are occurring in the economy are dramatic and we are moving more and more to services. Services tend to be footloose and they tend to go to places where people like to live. This is a very high livability place on a world scale. I see the demand for office space being very considerable in the future and you look at the up-take in the last year. It has not been from

traditional sources, it has been from new kinds of businesses. Jack Munro's union, even though we have produced record numbers of logs and sawed wood each year, is down to about 40% of what it was in 1981. The resource companies have also kept a pretty tight management. Well, where did all of the office space demand come from? Office buildings are filling up and by next year we are going to face a real crisis in office space. It is because of a lot of other stuff. The Pacific Rim thing is real. Take an example like Colliers McCauley Nichols - they used to be on the 16th floor of Granville Square and now they are on the 16th and 17th floors of Granville Square. Ladner Downs has just taken five floors of the new CP Office Building. These are all service industries and a lot of them are very committed to Asian trade. The Port of Vancouver is exploding and as the Port explodes we are going to need more customs brokers, etc.

- o I see one of the ways to promote is to let the developers over-build, let them keep a steady 20% vacancy rate. We have office space for $20 per foot. It is $300 per foot in Tokyo, $80 per foot in New York and $120 per foot in London. We look very good on a world scale and let's encourage developers to keep us looking good.

- o The Broadway corridor, for the first time since I have been following the office market, has a lower vacancy rate than the downtown core and a large amount of building is going in because people view Broadway as being a less-risky location in some ways. What happens is that people are not going to be paying the same rents on Broadway that they pay downtown. So people who need to be downtown are going to pay $20 plus per foot and the people who don't need to be there are going to take a location which in many ways is just as accessible. We have provided some choice. We now we have two rather different office markets and we have the possibility of creating some other sub-regional office markets: New Westminster, Burnaby Metrotown, Richmond and North Vancouver.

- o There are some public policy issues: what is going to happen to traffic congestion, open space, etc. A lot of that is a design issue. It still amazes me that you drive down streets like Howe and Hornby and people are allowed to park during the day. Through better traffic management, don't let anybody park on the street ever - ticket them, have left turn bays - there are lots of things we can do to make traffic flow more smoothly. Also, by putting people closer to jobs, we can get a lot of people walking and we are getting a natural decentralizaton of jobs in any event.

Michael Goldberg

- We have got to have a more flexible public policy response. We have got to do what we have been doing which is monitor, very carefully, traffic and not just vehicular traffic but pedestrian traffic. Some of the street corners are so clogged at lunchtime that you can't walk. We have got to have wider sidewalks and open space for those people.

- Those are important and legitimate issues and that is what the VCPC and Planning Department are there to protect. Sometimes we protect those through development whereas the tradition in Vancouver is that they are protected by saying no.

- The only way we are going to get open space now, that is meaningful, is to get developers to do it. The City doesn't have the money. If somebody builds a two-storey shopping mall downtown, let them dedicate the roof as open space. Let's get some meaningful open space. Some of the little intersections we have closed off in the West End provide cheap little parks. We can do a lot of that stuff. Again, the ideas have been around for a long time and it is just a question of realizing that those are important. Office workers like being able to go out on a summer day and sit and drink coffee. There is a common interest - the developers and the public interest.

- The pool of ideas that we have had typically has been very limited. They have been based on resource companies, our view of relatively static Vancouver covered by single-family housing and it has been a view that has been gotten by looking backward rather than forward. One of the nice things that is happening now is that we are getting so many people coming in from outside the region that they are bringing different ideas and many of our developers, unfortunately, have grown up here and as a result they haven't seen that there are these other possibilities. The other virtue is that the public itself needs to be educated. Instead of the Planning Department, as it did in the past, talking about the West End as being this cancerous evil that unless it's contained is going to spread like a big ooze over all of Vancouver it should be educating people. If you rezone the rest of the city to a West End density, it would take you two centuries to fill it up. We don't have the demand that is needed to fill up that kind of density in this city.

- It is very difficult to put in any density into that 80% of the city zoned RS-1. What we have got to do is work much harder educating the public. Like Kerrisdale where you have quite high-density in the most posh residential area. If you look at the single family

housing across the lane from the high rise apartment buildings, there has been no diminishment in value of those houses. Look at the Kerrisdale shopping area. One of the reasons it is so viable is that you have a very big slug of people who can walk to that shopping area and we have increased population density considerably around 41st and that has made a difference. We also have this reductio ad absurdum argument - "the thin edge of the wedge: if you let that land use change then the whole neighbourhood is going to change." Yet I know that the only way to ensure that neighbourhoods don't change is to provide little areas where we can bleed off the pressure. What makes a neighbourhood stable? I think it has much more to do with the people and if you allow a diversity of housing styles so that people can move through different phases of the life cycle in the same neighbourhood, then you get the same people in the neighbourhood and that creates stability. But we have broken that up so that younger people have to live in Richmond or Surrey and then when they get a little money they can buy a house in Marpole. If that works out well they can then move into Kerrisdale and they have to move out of Kerrisdale when their kids group up because they can't afford to stay there. What we are doing is promoting mobility and fragmentation.

- I would see south Hornby definitely being a finger of mixed residential office use which is already there. A lot of housing was illegally converted to office space after 1979 - 81. I think that is going to change. A lot of it is going to be switched back to housing because they are going to do okay. So I would see some fingers of residential coming up. There is a fair chunk of housing, a lot of it social housing, up along Seymour and Richards. Again, they will add to a stable population base and they will sneak up on us. You are not going to know that all the stuff is here until five years after and then we will look back. I would think that the very highly specialized automotive retail will be found on Seymour. I think it makes sense to leave it. The new hi-tech visions - it is highly unlikely that that stuff is going to go there. I can't think of any model anywhere in the world where hi-tech industry has chosen to come back into the city centre because there is nothing to attract it. Unlike Toronto, where there is a very big university, we don't have anything like that. What we are going to see is lots of different kinds of services. We may see the entertainment district strengthen considerably with more people living there...

- Tourist services are going to be enormously important. The boom we are experiencing now is just the beginning. The downtown is going to be the beneficiary to some extent. We are going to see more housing, offices and more diversity.

Michael Goldberg

- The place that really troubles me is Gastown. We did everything in Gastown and hopefully we finally convinced people the illogic of "healthy areas are pretty, therefore, if we make an area pretty it will be healthy" - that is fallacious. What we are having in Gastown is a very big stable social housing population now and we should have done that years ago. Now we have to change the laws so more people can move in there with other kinds of housing. Let's encourage the rail lands to be developed from Main Street west for housing. That is an area that nobody ever talks about. It is important that downtown be surrounded by three residential precincts: False Creek, West End, Gastown, and to have as many fingers as the market will bear connecting those. It is very easy to walk from Chinatown through Gastown around the Hudson's Bay. It is a half hour interesting walk. We must maximize those possibilities by creating some residential opportunities and we open up the waterfront in the process. Yaletown will take care of itself.

- My view is that where markets work, leave them alone because we are no good at second guessing markets. I have no objections to getting involved where markets don't work.

- I agree with Walter Hardwick, and I was convinced at the time that the private sector would have redeveloped the Pacific Center site and that the City could have condemned the land and sold it for a profit. But the City was in such a panic by the American urban fear that it gave Cadillac Fairview an incredible deal and they did it again on phase three and again in Victoria. Sooner or later we are going to have to realize that Canadian cities are not American cities. Canadians like urban life, Americans don't.

- Educate the public that all these opportunities need not be scary. Look at high density housing. Look at Kerrisdale and the success of the West End, and let's show street level pictures of people walking and the open space and ambience of the neighbourhood instead of stepping back and showing these buildings obliterating views. The Planning people can help educate developers and show them that there are lots of choices and that a lot of the choices are good for the City and developers. It need not be confrontational. The other side of the issue is that there is a lot that the public shouldn't do. Stay out of where the market works.

- When I was a graduate in California, Los Angeles was going to build a rapid transit system and it had to go from the centre out to some place. They couldn't figure out where the "centre" or the "some place" was. They are now building a transit system because they now

know where the centre is and that the Whilshire Corridor is the "some place". That is because urban form has started to stabilize - the shape of the economy has become clear. What I hope we would do is look around at what is happening in other places. What is happening in other places is an intensification realizing that everything does not have to go in the core. The market, by itself, is going to shake out uses that are inappropriate. What I see all over the U.S. and Canada is a strong core with equally strong nodes.

- We shouldn't fear the competition from Burnaby Metrotown. The people who are going to go into Metrotown are not the people who are going to go downtown. Adding to our choices is the key ingredient for planning. We are still at the point where we can have more of everything. Burnaby opened up opportunities rather than sealing them off. The only real problem I see in downtown is Gastown and Hastings Street. We still feel that we have got to have the Townsite Development Corporation - a whole bunch of artificial American public models. The Hastings Street shopping area from Main Street east or Main Street west is going to take care of itself as long as we allow the land uses to be sufficiently flexible so that we can attract people. There is no way we are going to get offices to go into Gastown. It is just not a good office location because you are at the eastern edge of downtown and we know that offices are face-to-face communication so that has got to be in the core. Gastown is a great place to live potentially.

- The shape of cities... Vancouver in one sense has changed dramatically since 1968 and in another sense the pattern was well laid out before. When all is said and done, cities are about people interacting and not computers interacting. All you have to do is live and work downtown and you realize why cities exist and all this space age garbage about having work stations at home and satellite work centres is nonsense. The urban futurists drive me wild... Until there is a basic change in the hard wiring of the human mind, I don't see a basic change in cities. Cities have clearly been a dominant residential form and in 10,000 years they have become the most successful form for people to live and work in.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Walter Hardwick

WITH: Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE: June 17, 1988

PLACE: City Hall

- It's worthwhile dealing with the context. In the early 1960's there was little growth in downtown.

- There was a policy to counter this, not one you can find in a book. It was an assumed policy. I can tell you precisely what the elements were. Number one - parking was a problem and so the City created the DPC.

- The second one was to plan the freeway and the third crossing of Burrard Inlet to bring customers back to the CBD.

- The third element was expropriation of Block 42, to add to Block 52 (Eaton's) to create a site for Pacific Centre which was perceived as City investment to stimulate development.

- Now, the problem with this whole process is that, although in 1960 downtown needed a crank, speed of implementation was glacial and by the time they got around to doing things in '67 and '68, the economy had turned around. In the final analysis it's the economy that drives the City, not plans.

- Now what was the counter policy that really emerged in the 60's? The counter policy basically said - increase density in the inner-city so that downtown retailing becomes the shopping centre for the inner-city. The second was a policy of sharing a greater portion of the management of Canada's public and private endeavors. In fact, that explosive growth in office buildings in the late 60's and in the early 70's was in large measure stimulated by federal and national corporations.

Walter Hardwick

- In the immediate post-war years downtown growth was based upon expansion of business managing our natural resources in the province. The '68 - '74 growth was based upon sharing a greater proportion of national and public and private management. Now, in the 1980's it's the growth of the producer services.

- Producer Services are really contracting out of services rather than keeping them to a headquarter staff.

- The professional contractors gain expertise, and then they use it to become self-generative. It's not only the lawyers, accountants and the management consultants, but it's also the advertising and marketing people, the architects and engineers.

- So as we approach 1990 we now have to ask ourselves what's going to be propellant of the next round? It's not going to be management of resources. I don't think there's going to be more devolution of Canada's national headquarters here. The producer services may grow, but they will plateau. It brings us, as far as downtown Vancouver is concerned, into tourism managment and services to the Pacific Rim. I don't see any other major uses that would be downtown oriented.

- There's another change going on here. We are having an expansion in the production of goods - an increase in secondary manufacturing. Examples are Mr. Jax in the textile, ragtrade business, Nexus in satellite communications, MDI in mobile communications.

- The great growth firm of last year was in video marketing. A local company is the largest video distributor in North America. Now another local company has become the largest in the world producing plastic video display cases. This type of business is not CBD located. It is in Richmond.

- In these firms where management of production and distribution activities is hands-on, management resides where the production is. It is only when a firm becomes multi-divisional that management will separate itself from production. Many of these growth activities are going to favour managers locating in Richmond, Surrey and Langley, not in Vancouver.

- A detriment to Vancouver growth is the price of housing.

Walter Hardwick

- UBC is having real problems recruiting. In our department, we had some really good people come but they just looked at the price of housing and turned around and stayed where they were. They cannot afford to substantially downgrade their living style.

- (Interviews question: Do you feel then there are to be any conscious efforts to lower the price of housing or simply to increase the supply?)

  I agree with Mike Goldberg that the stock flow model works. What you've got essentially is the demand-driven model.

- In the last five years, the regional population increased 20,000 a year. That was under restraint. I think in the 1990's we can expect 40,000 per year.

- The current off-shore immigrants are urban-based and monied, and that is different than Portuguese miners and Scottish tradesmen who 20 years ago moved to Cranbrook, Fernie and Kitimat. Toronto and Vancouver are major destinations now, not rural Canada.

- As people get older and established with families they move less frenquently and an increasing number of the migrants are older and retired people, they come and stay.

- Rather than our economic growth in the next 15 years being central city oriented, it's going to be peripherally oriented. That is a different basis of growth than in the previous two decades.

- The financial and the Pacific Rim services will be in the central city but the industrial activities will not, at least in their initial phases. Glenayre, MDI, MacDonald-Detweiler, Microtel Pacific, and Nexus. You just go down the list of them and there isn't one of them that's in Vancouver.

- I just don't think that the demand and growth of office space in the 90's is going to be in the order it was in '75-'78 period.

- There is just about no export for lawyers' services.

Walter Hardwick

- o There's been an enormous trend toward contracting out or as it is being described in the literature now as "vertical disintegration". We have an opportunity to benefit from vertical disintegration of a North American as well as a Pacific economy.

- o We are benefiting from vertical disintegration here right now and that's in the motion picture business.

- o I've talked to some motion picture people about why they think Vancouver is the place to film. What it really comes down to is the quality of the environment.

- o Media people are very footloose. They see Vancouver as a good place to live, a safe place to live.

- o Another ingredient that comes out of these analyses is the importance of the entrepreneur manager that knows the market and can assemble people to do a job. This is why Mr. Jax is working, a top-flight President with world-wide knowledge was hired..

- o They now have about 800 employees up from about 60 a few years ago.

- o If I were running an economic development office I would say that where we have people with skills we should hire these top managers who know world business. I think people will come here in larger numbers if we keep a quality environment and a safe city.

- o Vancouver lost when Noranda took over MacMillan Bloedel. Mac Blo is no longer using the volume of producer services that it was when it was an independent company.

- o On the other hand, the Fletcher Challenge have made this the headquarters for North America and that is good because they are now aggressively pursuing business continent wide and we'll benefit from that.

- o We're running in a global economy and the government can't do very much about that. We can keep viable things, and begin to understand the process of change. A model might be something that's going on in Quebec right now which they call "market nationalism".

Walter Hardwick

- (Interviewers question: Is the growth that comes from contracting out and vertical disintegration going to need those downtown AAA buildings?)

  Yes, generally. One of the attractions of downtown to producer services is like being a retailer in Pacific Centre, you hang your shingle out where people go shopping for services. If you're in beautiful downtown Burnaby or Coquitlam you're harder to find than in downtown. The cautionary note that I would make, is that nearly all the office and retail growth in Atlanta has been in three regional centres north of town. Now why did they leave Atlanta? That was essentially because of ghettoization and loss of the middle class in the inner city. Now the middle class has a strong base here. The thing that is going to make it tough for them may be the price of houses.

- This was no different than it was in '68 when we advocated redevelopment of False Creek. False Creek and West End development was expected to provide inner-city housing at affordable prices. And affordable to me means affordable to income groups right across the board. That the range of housing must parallel the range of incomes. Vancouver is just on the verge of not being affordable.

- The variable cost in housing is land. The recent expansion in price is in part fed by a psychology of scarcity. So what city policy should do is to dull that. If we can create a policy that provides an assured supply of housing is coming on the market then the land component should not inflate to the degree it has. And that is a policy that the city should work for. The real inflation in house prices started in the 1960's in Vancouver when Oakridge was filled in. Up until that time people believed that there was always new land to build on so there was no scarcity psychology. Once Oakridge went, suddenly something clicked, an era has ended. The visible availability of land was gone. So the provision of new residential land has to be part of our downtown strategy - to encourage a steady flow of residences on to the market. The Planning Department must do everything that it can within reason to advance it.

- In the final analysis below market housing requires senior government subsidies. The City hasn't got the money for it.

- The housing mix will reflect the major groups that are working. They are professional people. And then what you've got to determine is what proportion of that group are going to be first time buyers.

Walter Hardwick

- People are buying privacy and view. I don't have too big a problem with density. I had concerns with density in the centre part of the West End, never on the fringes. Now that's one of the nice things about False Creek North. You are essentially building a fringe development. You'll have more problems of density in that unnamed area between Yaletown and Granville. Technically that is all Yaletown. The Yale Hotel was the centre of Yaletown. Now what density you may put in there needs a pretty careful look because that's a bit like the middle West End. With the lack of amenities and all the rest, it becomes more problematic.

- A lot of the decentralization which has taken place in San Francisco has been of back office functions. One of the great attractions of being downtown used to be that's where you could find the single female labour force which was the necessary raw material for that kind of activity. Now that is drying up. The attraction for many there is to move out to suburban office parks to employ second-income women. The point I'm making is that second-income women are going to be even more important to the labour force in the future. If you can keep women and families within the inner-city, at least you don't have to push back office activity to the suburbs.

- The Livable Region town centre concept had a basic flaw. The planners thought they were also going to get business like B.C. Tel. To be very realistic, regional town centres got consumer-oriented services, personal services, and business services, like lawyers looking after divorce law.

- The Livable Region Plan mistakenly assumed that corporate management jobs would show up in the suburbs, and would go into a town centre. They never did. They moved adjacent to their factory. Only if it became a multi-unit firm would they likely move downtown.

- We don't have much north-south transportation problems. I think people move remarkably easily. The grids are the most efficient transportation frameworks in the world. The least efficient is the freeway.

- Our transport problems are in the southeast corridor.

- I would not have adopted the ALRT. We had a plan in 1974 that was nearly adopted which would have used conventional rail or busways.

Walter Hardwick

- The second ALRT to Richmond will do no good. A busway would.

- The third crossing, I don't think, makes any sense unless we look seriously at adding the Sunshine Coast to the region. Then the third crossing is the one off Clark Drive, the centre harbour option. You wouldn't look at the First Narrows.

- If Bill Curtis wants to put a freeway in the Grandview Cut, he would defeat himself the day it was opened. The number of people would just fill it up. However, if he restricted it to a truck route, he would be doing an enormous service.

- There is no evidence that automation reduces employment in the longer term. There are many things being invented, new products and new services because of this. Certain plants at times and certain offices will get adjustments. No questions about it. But in the long-term picture automation creates more work and in the process upgrades the task of the persons on the front line.

- Who will work downtown? Second-income women. Second-income men.

- I have no problem with building all the housing we can there, and I believe it will be in demand.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: David Hulchanski

WITH: Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE: September 8, 1988

PLACE: City Hall

---

o The City of Vancouver is part of a region but we don't have much regional planning. The downtown needs to be seen in context of the whole region, especially the town centres.

There is a lot of dispersal happening. I don't think we have a good grasp on how much is happening. I think planned dispersal is very positive and should be encouraged. If there is dispersal, you don't have the one-way crunch traffic in rush hour. Other communities around the city's limits can have town centres and activity nodes.

You hear from people who own property and do business in the downtown area. They want downtown to grow. They want property values to go up. That is naturally their interest - the way the system works. I am not sure who has the interest in regional planning in this region. In whose interest is it to take this bigger look and to coordinate the things?

o The core area of the entire region is the central area of the City of Vancouver, so there is a lot of pressure on the core. Land pressures are higher and development pressures are higher. To some extent, the pressures can be lowered. It is not realistic to think it could be lowered by a lot, but it can be lowered some. The rate of increase would hopefully be less in one scenario than in another.

In terms of planning, and especially long-range planning, how does one encourage the regional perspective, given political realities and market realities; given that things don't change very rapidly and planners don't call very many shots.

o A city like Vancouver could take a position of "we are the city and we don't care about other places in the region; we want our CBD to capture all new development, we want everything in there." That is one attitude and one approach which is not very constructive and is going against the tide. There is so much room in the region and dispersal is already happening.

David Hulchanski

There is a world that consists of really major national and multi-national corporations and they are relatively immune to price; their costs can be passed on. Then there are the related services to them - the big law firms, the big advertising firms, etc. - that are also immune to costs because they are all part of that big corporate network where costs get passed on to us in everything we buy. Down the line, there are the more intermediate size companies and corporations which might be regionally based. They need office space but it doesn't have to be downtown. My reason for raising this is for planners to know a bit more about this. Then you have better predictive powers. The whole purpose of planning is educated guesses about what is likely to happen and then you can plan. Is something good or bad? Do we want this or not? Then you have something to offer people who ultimately make that decision. There is a question we all would like to know five or ten years from now: what might the downtown area look like in terms of commercial activity, housing activity, housing cost?

- In my assessment, Vancouver and B.C., as all the boosters are saying, has too much going for it. It is not going to be in recession for long periods. It is not going to stagnate.

- Vancouver has a good location and excellent amenities. The majority of the earth's population are now coming into their own and that is going to have an impact on us. We are feeling it with all this immigration. Already Canada has an excellent reputation compared to the U.S. Other countries would rather send their students and their experts for training to Canada than the U.S. - there is a safety factor. You can't have a good reputation if people are shooting each other on the freeway - the world knows about that. Canada has the image of a more stable and physically safe and more of a polite culture compared to the United States. There was a poll highly publicized in Japan with the question being, "Who do you, the Japanese, think has the highest quality of housing and neighbourhood standards?" The answer was Canada, Sweden, and some other European country, but not the States because of the crime and image. They watch a lot of American T.V. I have never known a country to be so badly served by the public entertainment image that it projects.

- We are going to boom and the unfortunate thing with booms is that they are of short duration and they cause tremendous dislocation and they last for about 2 years or so. Toronto's boom could stabilize but won't end because it is the "downtown" of Canada. Vancouver is a regional downtown. It will boom and bust. Toronto can't bust. It could cease to boom, it could stabilize.

David Hulchanski

- I see real problems with housing and they are the kinds of problems that many in the business community don't know about or don't care about. It is not that they are necessarily uncaring people, it is that they don't think about it or they hardly know that a whole lot of people exist who live in a totally different way than the upper middle class.

  In ten years, if people aren't aware and things aren't done, the single room occupancy stock will be all gone. Just think about it. Look at the location of that land in the Downtown-Eastside area. The positive thing is the amount of social housing being built because that is there permanently and is permanently affordable. There should be a priority to get more and more social housing there. That would protect and stabilize the Downtown-Eastside community.

- (Interviewer's question: Will the fact that we can open up vast amounts of new land for development help relieve the pressure on the West End because developers would say "I don't have to fool around in the West End. It is so hard to get a little site together there and to knock things down. I can instead go to this new land and build higher density." Does this help the West End or does it hurt the West End because so much more is happening nearby?)

  You are bringing a lot of land on the market but that theory (that increased land supply helps protect existing neighbourhoods) only holds if there was effective public planning, if there were rational development control processes. What you have instead is a whole bunch of individual land owners. They are all then trying to beat the other guy.

  All around Pacific Place anybody who owns land wants to maximize their return. Any given year there is only so much housing demand. Who is going to supply it and who is going to market it? So some guy will play around and buy up some parcels and beat Li Ka Shing by a year or two - why shouldn't he do that - it is natural - market dynamics.

- (Interviewer's question: Isn't it true that anything the City can do that brings on more land for housing is, in the long-term, helpful to our housing?)

  Again, that is true in "theory" and makes sense but the reality is different. You could zone massively for high density residential. But the city can only absorb so many units of this or that kind of condo each year. Who is going to build them? I see it (increased

supply of land zoned for housing) affecting price very little. Developers want their returns and they will wait. Another reason why that theory doesn't work is that there are some very big parcels and they are all owned by a few large corporations.

- o If there are vacancies of a certain class of office space, it will help lower prices. That doesn't happen in housing. There is a very small market segment of people with the income and desire to buy those kinds of units. The people who develop those kinds of units are on top of that. You have got to know your market or you are down the tubes. You can't let the things sit there empty. The office developers are huge corporate entities. But not the housing developers. It's "dog-eat-dog" but they won't "eat dog" to the extent where they create high housing vacancies...

- o Pacific Place can offer one type of condo product and there is a market for a certain amount of that. What the other local guys do around town is assemble 3 or 4 houses where the zoning is right or where they can get the right zoning and then build something quite interesting. It is in a neighbourhood or near a neighbourhood. It is not in downtown. People will seek those out so there is always a place for these small to medium size condo developers. The West End, for instance, will always have development pressure because it is an established desirable neighbourhood so it holds a certain advantage.

- o Let's move into another topic. Buildings are aging. All the units built in the 1950's to mid-70's - the hi-rise concrete tower boxes, are 20 to 30 years old, and soon need complete replacement of plumbing, elevators, everything. There is no way that can be done by the owners. The owners own them to reap the interim rental profits and then to market the site. That is a very serious thing that we are just beginning to face. If you spend public RRAP money on these buildings and make them really nice, twice the rent is charged. What good is that to society? If, on the other hand, you have too much of a good undertaking from the public's point of view, the developers are not going to do it. That stock is increasingly being lost one way or another to decay. We are not yet talking about social housing, low cost housing, modest cost housing... we are just talking about the existing rental stock that is in that hi-rise form.

David Hulchanski

- Referring again to Pacific Place - there is always going to be demand for almost any place in the West End. There are always going to be people who want to live there and not at Pacific Place. There will always be redevelopment pressures on the rental stock to be converted to condo and tearing down the older rental stock to redevelop at a higher density as condo.

- On South False Creek, I think the City did an excellent job. It was a very good process deciding what to do with it. Lots of public debate, a travelling road show around the city. There were six options, from pure parkland to high-density. Then the decision that the City would be the developer.

  The City did everything right and there is proof there that the City can do things, can plan a neighbourhood. They set objectives and met all the objectives. It didn't cost the City anything - it was developed on a cost recovery basis.

- (Interviewer's question: Would you have done False Creek South as such low density?)

  No. Remember that the False Creek South densities were the result of a political compromise. Many people wanted the site to be totally park so when looked at in the context of when the decision was made, it was a very good decision. It was a democratic decision. It was a decision that satisfied most people. With hindsight now, and we always have hindsight, I am sure they could double the density and still have it as pleasant and desirable as it is now and still have almost as much open space, etc.

- In a new book by John Galbraith, he says we have, in the United States and in all advanced industrial nations, a society that can provide... even to poor people... to everybody except the extremely poor... an incredible range of commodities and goods. But there is one thing that this society can't do... produce modest cost housing.

- Our society has no alternate mechanism. 95%, almost 96% of the country's housing stock is private. 4% is social housing. That is all the social housing that has been built since they began building in 1948-49... Where is the supply of modest cost housing going to come from and are we going to be able to at least keep the existing stock that we now have? The answer is no. The trends in the West End and the Downtown-Eastside are all pointing in the opposite way.

David Hulchanski

Where is the supply going to come from for new stock? These are the problems of the 1990's and 2000. In Toronto these concerns occupy the most senior people, both corporate and government; corporations can't move people to Toronto. Ontario Place can't hire students to work in the summer unless they house them.

- This is why the maintenance of the existing affordable rental stock is so important because that is the most efficient affordable housing game in town... to maintain your modest cost stock. This is the Downtown- Eastside; this is the West End; and this is the secondary suites. The Ontario government is paying people to put second suites in.

- Vancouver, I predict, in 5 years will be in this place...this business about selling zoning. People take moral stances... "We don't sell zoning!" That is a lot of garbage. We give it away right now. If you own a parcel of land and you want to rezone you go to the City and you get it for free, but you keep all the extra land value. How can the City pay for the infrastructure that it needs? San Francisco and Toronto don't give it away free any longer and why... they can't afford to because of social costs. The reason that Toronto can do a lot is because it is Canada's downtown and almost no matter what, builders and developers still develop there. Kamloops can't do it. Surrey can't do it... Regina can't do it... but Vancouver can do it. Big places under growth-pressure can and must impose reasonable development costs.

- It (extracting public goods from developers) is not going to solve the problems. It is a trade-off. You are not giving something away for free any longer... it is another step. This is one of the things that the City can do in terms of raising more revenue. Any new project carries with it all kinds of costs, and there are not just economic costs. What do the people of the city get back in return? They get the taxes but that is true of any place.

- Any little measure that anybody recommends, is less than the full measure and it can be shot down for that. Anybody opposing it knows that it won't work because it doesn't do the job. It only gets done incrementally. We have to do things and in doing things we learn more. I am all in favour of incremental things and I know how easy they can be shot down and, how by themselves, sound so dumb... That is much better than doing nothing.

David Hulchanski

There is no such thing as "the" solution and there never will be. There are steps in the right directions and some of the steps turn out to be not in the right direction, but we won't know that until we try them. We are going to learn from them. We are going to learn about the next step after that.

o A lot of things that TEAM brought in in 1973 are taken for granted now. They are the philosophy of even conservative people. TEAM was sort of a radical party of professors and liberals, etc. coming in with all these contrary ideas and it made a very dramatic change. It is accepted conventional wisdom now... Why? Because the real world is happening around us and forcing us to think differently in different ways. Every day Vancouver changes, changing people's attitudes, insights, and positions on things. This is why, at times, there is a dramatic shift because in 1973 the politicians were so out of tune with where the voters were. In a number of years it is going to be more acceptable to say, "Hey, what are we going to get from this, what is the public really getting from all this (new development)?"

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Denny Boyd

WITH: Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE: July 26, 1988

PLACE: Denny Boyd's Office

Note: Instead of a transcript, we have reprinted Denny Boyd's column on this topic, written just after the interview.

GROWN-UP VANCOUVER OF 2003 COULD BE ONE BIG TRAFFIC JAM

It has been creeping murder on Georgia Street every afternoon.

It has been tough on the Upper Levels, with that resurfacing at Capilano, and commuter aggravation has simmered and boiled at Hastings and Cassiar, on Highway One, on the Mary Hill Bypass, the Langley Exit, King George Highway and on the narrow, dicey lanes of the Patullo Bridge.

Hot weather isn't the cause, it simply exacerbates the usual problems on those distant extensions of downtown Vancouver's traffic impact.

And if you think it has been tough this week, what will it be like in the year 2003?

This week I spent an absorbing 90 minutes with two Vancouver city planners.

Ronda Howard, senior planner, central area, of the Vancouver city planning department and Joyce Catliff, executive coordinator of the Vancouver city planning commission, are preparing a comprehensive blueprint to deal with the downtown Vancouver of 15 years in the future.

Their opinion- and expectation-gathering includes interviewing professionals, special interest groups, downtown business leaders, central area organizations, individual citizens and journalists.

This week we talked about densities, lifestyles, building codes, vanishing views, housing, building heights, infrastructure decay, cultural reshaping, noise abatement, heritage concerns, the GVRD, the new uptown and the changing social mix.

What I found most intriguing was how many times, and from how many points on the social compass, we returned to the same subject, the automobile -- our friend, our servant and our strangler.

Denny Boyd

I hope to devote another column or two on the idea of downtown Vancouver 2003, and then to throw the floor open to suggestions from you, what you envision and expect of Vancouver in 15 years. We'll compile your suggestions and pass them on to the planners.

But we can't talk about urban expansion, new housing, waterfront development, parks, aquariums, stadiums, shopping centres, office towers or mega-stores without computing the impact any such development will have on traffic flow and parking.

Case in point: A major part of the enraged public outcry in West Vancouver against a tower development at Marine and Taylor Way (Faulty Towers, they're calling it) was based not so much on the height of the development but on the effect of an estimated 400 tenant cars on that intersection.

While speaking to Howard and Catliff, I urged a new mid-town ring-road to share the commuter strain on Georgia, wistfully wished that parking was banned on both sides of Robson, from Burrard to Jervis, and that the city and Burnaby could work out a joint plan to re-develop Kingsway into something grander than a miles-long used car lot.

One of the possibilities of downtown Vancouver 2003 is high-density housing, 20 to 30 storeys high, in the western part of the Golden Triangle -- Pender-Georgia-Burrard -- and on Granville, possibly from Nelson to the foot of the Granville Street Bridge.

These would be planned for the urban professional, the two-job yuppie couple of the future, either with no children or with a flown-coop, who would walk to work and use their car only on weekends.

Other suggestions involve increased rapid transit and an inexpensive jitney-like service for the downtown core, short-hauling pedestrian shoppers, again to discourage people from bringing and parking their cars downtown.

At the moment, any downtown development, business or residential is dependent on guaranteed, built-in parking, based approximately on one parking slot for every 1,100 feet of floor space.

Back in the Seventies, city hall came up with the notion that if no parking space was required in new construction, the occupants of the new buildings would leave their cars at home and use public transit.

The motion was gravely wrong because it failed to address the grip our cars hold on our egos and our lifestyle expectations.

Denny Boyd

We live in nature's display suite and our cars take us to the beaches, parks and mountains that define our unique lifestyle. But they also threaten to smother us.

Tomorrow, a parking expert explains why.

(Note: Further Denny Boyd columns on this topic and letters he received from the public will be assembled in a separate booklet).

Reprinted with permission

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Philip Boname

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : July 5, 1988

PLACE : Office of Urbanics Consultants Ltd.

- In the context of downtown development we need to promote and generate captains of industry who come to the fore, not so much from the pressure of investment yields, but from recognition that often best investment deals are more often predicated on quality than on time limitation. The issue of quality has to be given much greater prevalence and dominance.

- To fund a professional football team and a first class opera or a first class art gallery you need a certain critical mass of population and a certain critical economic base, a criticial mass of income and expenditure - their existence and success will vary but not so much by just population size but by the wealth in the community. The other dynamic within that general dynamic is what the downtown is all about. I think urbanity is one where you do have a very strong, exciting, attractive and vibrant downtown. You will find, for example, in Los Angeles, until recently, they had no downtown and because of that, had no urbanity in a broader sense of the word. The population or size of the community itself should not be singled out as the important variable but also the way in which the downtown in that community has evolved and is about to evolve.

- I am glad we can say the Stadium came downtown. I am very glad the Convention Centre is downtown. I think both of those major land uses are examples of the direction in which we should continue to evolve at least for some time in creating that critical mass within the downtown and particularly to the extent that our economy is going to be increasingly dependent on both the tourism industry and the services industry. We have to be cautious of where we put direct- or indirect-related tourism/visitor traffic-generating elements. These elements should be located where the public community will achieve maximum benefits, and when I say this I am referring to the taxation on restaurants and hotels and any business enterprise. If the stadium had gone out to Coquitlam or Surrey, then you would not have seen nearly the same economic benefits that go to the hospitality business infrastructure and through that

infrastructure to the public purse. So even though the Stadium may not be quite as successful right now as it was intended to be, a case can be made that it is much more successful than if you had put it in Surrey. DVA will tell you that Vancouver's Convention Centre is achieving a very significant market position, in competition with, unfortunately, a growing number of competing convention centres. Had it not been downtown, had it not been on the water's edge, you would have seen a much different reaction in terms of public response and in terms of the interest of conventioneers who have decided to come to Vancouver. I am harping on these two to emphasize the fact that for the foreseeable future I think we should be very cautious about allowing major traffic-generating institutions to be located too far away from the downtown area. Science World fortunately is in what I would call the downtown edge area. The Broadway situation starts stretching things. I'd like to think of downtown as being the peninsula.

- I see a people-movement system being much more economically justifiable by virtue of the fact that these traffic-generating "beads on the string" have been placed is such close juxtaposition to one another that they can re-enforce the notion of a downtown movement system. It doesn't have to be a San Francisco trolley cablecar but I think we could devise a system here that is unique functionally and aesthetically to Vancouver and would be, in itself, a reason to come to Vancouver It would tie False Creek components including Granville Island, Science World, with Chinatown, Gastown, Convention Centre, CPR/ALRT terminals and of course Robson Street, Stanley Park and English Bay - ideally all together. The net results would be phenomenal in terms of reducing the amount of traffic that continues to plague the downtown area, particularly during summer months.

- The human race is racing desperately to generate more leisure time on a year-round basis.

  Retail is going to change because of technological and telemarketing systems. This augers well for downtown. We will be doing our convenience shopping on the TV screen. It frees up our time and comparative shopping is increasingly a leisure pursuit and downtown is where that true manifestation of leisure shopping and shopping as a leisure experience can be best manifested in conjunction with cultural and entertainment pursuits. I am very excited about downtown at the expense of suburban activities. The notion of mixing more and more leisure pursuits and cultural/entertainment pursuits with retailing in your large suburban shopping centres

which are furthest removed from downtown - you will see that trend continuing as well. People get out to shop to see and to be seen as much as to spend money and Robson Street is a strong manifestation of that attitude.

- I am not knocking Pacific Centre. I am saying that Vancouver is different from Toronto, different from Montreal and we have the opportunities as expressed by Robson Street... to continue to allow good street retailing to flourish. You are going to see more and more street retailing coming back to the fore. Robson Street is the most classic demonstration, I think in Canada, of people's changing attitude towards street retailing or creating good street retailing.

- I think Granville Mall will eventually see a renaissance if one can argue that it ever really had a strong retailing infrastructure. I argued in favour of reopening the traffic to Georgia Street because I think in terms of timing, it would simply accelerate the evolution of having that street become exciting and more vital to the area. Sparks Street (Ottawa) is a classic pedestrian mall whereas Granville Mall is a transit mall and again we are mixing objectives. If the object is to create an ideal solution to a public transportation system, well then let's recognize that as the objective and put that system where it will not have negative impacts on either of the other two objectives i.e. restoration of street retailing or creating downtown open space/park amenities where people gather.

  So I am saying that in the case of Granville Mall, yes, north of Georgia Street, I think the case can be made with the fact that it succeeded. It has succeeded for a range of other reasons - you have a different building infrastructure, different population infrastructure, you have more of the established core, you have a higher density of daytime employment. The Orpheum and other theatres would do much better by virtue of having their storefronts/entrances on Granville as opposed to using Seymour or adjacent entrances and that can only happen, in my estimation, legitimately if cars are restored to the street.

- I am a very strong advocate of letting people congregate in tight areas. Robson Street's excitement has evolved, in part, because you turn away from the "planning textbook" on what the lineal distance should be from storefront to curb per capita of passing traffic. The thing that is so beautiful about Robson Street is that the sidewalks are tight enough to cause people to slow down and enjoy the merchandise and enjoy the people they are surrounded by. Expand

that sidewalk by twice and maintain the same traffic stream - you increase the velocity of that traffic, you reduce the time exposure to the merchandise and reduce that very, very important social chemistry.

In the case of Granville Mall the thought was that... you will have to destroy the sidewalk and I say yes, you can reduce some of the sidewalks but you don't have to reduce it entirely. I would see retailing and cafes coming out onto those 19-foot sidewalks to a greater extent than exists today.

(Interviewer's question: When you mentioned Robson Street and you had a very well-described point about the slowness and the congestion but then if you do want to have sidewalk cafes, you are so limited.)

They may have to be "punctured" in some cases (the Robson Galleria). I suggest too, that the merchant might want to step back if it gets congested or a number of merchants might want to step back, i.e. store fronts set back within a building structure.

- Notwithstanding, the phenomenal impact, which I suggest we are going to see emerging out of the electronic communication exponential rate of changes, i.e. the technical impact of satellite communications, FAX etc., there is going to be, conversely, a stronger off-setting attitude for people to socialize. As we spend more time looking at that green plate in our home or office, there is going to be a corresponding tremendous force to get out and meet people. The fact remains that people want to be in an area where they can walk across the street and do business with one another or meet at social places such as pub/restaurants to conduct business or just socialize. I see a very, very strong need for people to congregate and interact with one another as this technical revolution takes place.

  I keep saying it - the downtown has the infrastructure - has the greatest opportunity of responding to this behavioral need.

- In terms of encouraging residential development downtown, which I very strongly support, we must be cautious that the location of such encouragement does not run counter to the continued encouragement of office agglomeration or concentration. One of the ways around that... has not had as much success here as it has had in other areas, is not preventing the vertical stacking of uses. It is very difficult to do in this city because our densities are lower by half than most cities, such as Calgary's, and our height restrictions have a part to play in that as well and the result is that we have some diseconomies that make it difficult to efficiently plan for stacked land uses.

Philip Boname

- We are not a premier office city, least not as yet, and this is one of the most important dynamics which I would like to address in terms of the function of the downtown. A premier office city is one which accommodates national or international corporate head offices and we have been and will continue to be, at least in the short term, a branch office city and that has important implications on downtown planning.

  Calgary is a premier city. It has the second largest concentration of corporate head offices in the world for the oil/energy industry, second only to Houston. It has a much larger concentration of office space in the downtown areas than does Vancouver notwithstanding the fact that its metropolitan population is only half of Vancouver's. On a per capita basis, Calgary probably has more office space than any city in North America. If we had a premium corporate office situation here, I suggest to you that the 9:1 density that is currently the highest ratio allowed in the downtown, would not have been as gracefully accepted as it has been to date. We will continue, probably, to see buildings that are going to be less than 500,000 square feet simply because the largest private sector corporate tenants are not much larger than 85,000 square feet in size. In Calgary you can find 20 or 30 tenants that are over, say 200,000 square feet in size.

- Will the emergence of Vancouver as an important city in the Pacific Rim lead to the possibility of attracting either national and international corporate head offices? I am not sure. What I see as being the more important future prospect for Vancouver is the notion that the wealthier and more dynamic and more attractive and higher-rate-growing cities of North America will be those which have found a way to attract brain trusts. By brain trusts I mean where both the academic and corporate interest relating to hi-tech and computer technology and new sciences are concentrated. I am extremely bullish about Vancouver in that context because brain trusts are increasingly going to be located where lifestyles and leisure pursuits are perceived to be most attractive.

  We need not take a second-row seat to any other city in North America when it comes to livability, leisure pursuits, recreation, security, cleanliness, and hopefully, educational quality.

- There is a level of mixed-ethnic tolerance here that is a very important resource that we don't seem to be taking very full advantage of in terms of attracting businesses and people.

Philip Boname

- I would like to see more money being spent in research particularly in the post-graduate categories. This city, together with the Provincial Government, should make a major push for a share of the Federal Government's recent decision to spend more money in research.

- One of the biases which I will share right now on the tape recorder is the fact that our biggest single detriment in terms of moving ahead in the lifestyle and economic and downtown programming perspective is the the fact that our metropolitan urban area is balkanized by archaic political boundaries and we are paying for that significantly. This is the downtown for the Lower Mainland and we are paying an inordinant amount of money for security, police, fire, telephone, sewers - for all ranges of resources because we have these obsolete boundaries. There is no reason today, for example, why we should have a Burnaby and a Vancouver.

- (Interviewer's question: We have heard people say that good people do want to come here because of the livability but the prices of housing are so high. Do you find that is problem or not?)

  It is important that when we start looking at the price of housing that we compare it to our average income. If we are finding that Vancouver is experiencing an inordinant increase in affordability where persons of average income have to spend a bit more of their disposable income on shelter than the comparable case in Winnipeg, Toronto or Halifax, then that would concern me. Without question, we are facing right now an inflationary pressure due to our emergence as an important city on the Pacific Rim. We have to give the supply side time to adjust to increased demand levels.

- Many people who are leaving Hong Kong or who are making an investment in a home here are not doing so on purely a negative basis, i.e. as a "refuge" from the 1997 Hong Kong merger with China. They are doing it also because they see Vancouver as an interesting place to raise a family. One of the most striking things about Vancouver that people from as close as United States can't quite fathom is how this city can be so clean. Our downtown is a more livable downtown. It is a downtown that exists in a vibrant way after five o'clock whereas, unfortunately, too many downtown areas in North America still suffer from a 5:00 p.m. rug-rolling-up syndrome.

Philip Boname

- (Interviewer's question: What do you think are the things in our downtown that make it much more vibrant than Calgary?)

  A setting; a climatic condition; a greater degree of concern with our built forms. There is still room for more pocket-parks - they don't have to be large. Discovery Park is a delightful mini-oasis. What was done across from the Cathedral on Dunsmuir is another example but with two or three more of those in more strategically located situations to provide areas where people can congregate and have had more festive and entertainment activities. It would have been nice to have had the Science World downtown as a means of attracting a broader range of age groups on a more continuous basis.

- You will find more children inter-mingling in the downtown area which is another dimension that we lack compared to Europeans cities.

  I don't think this is necessarily dependent on only having more downtown family housing units as much as creating the opportunities and the excitement of events where the family stays together and comes downtown. We have to be cautious about assuming that we can manifest significant changes in terms of shelter provisions for families in the downtown area. I take the attitude that we should let the market place dictate, particularly in the core area the configuration of housing types, and let those people who are working downtown, and who are desirous of living downtown, be the first choice people to live downtown.

  If they have families and can afford the larger accommodations, granted that would be very nice, but my first thought is creating the climate, the wherewithal where families, children, babies, are encouraged to come downtown and frequent activities that cater to the family.

- How do you make provision for the natural growth and concentration of office buildings in the core area? How far can we go in impeding the future capacity requirement in terms of other uses? If we are going to maintain current densities, it starts putting limitations on the office core area as it exists now compared to the situation than if we were to re-examine densities and/or building heights. I think that Vancouver, in the next 5 or 10 years, could become an internationally recognized premier corporate head-office city. It suggests that we should be cautious about ending up with too much premature intrusion of more office land use resulting in an otherwise scatteration or breaking-up of the office core. Be cautious about residential development too close to the existing office core.

Philip Boname

I'm in favour of looking at Downtown South as the next residential pocket; keep a buffer or "swing zone" between it and the office core, as a "safety valve". Turn up the fire under the Downtown South and don't worry about exact boundaries. Keep options open. Preserve a second and third ring for optional office (between Downtown South and CBD).

Accentuate residential where major office is not likely.

- Pacific Place and Downtown South will become increasingly attractive to people who used to be interested in single-family homes. People's pursuit of leisure is increasing and they want time for other activities besides maintaining a single-family home.

- Higher densities and livability is misunderstood. It's the quality of urban design which is important. Urbanity is the positive off-shoot. We can have higher densities in small areas with relief in other areas for parks and recreation, etc. If properly administrated, higher densities should provide the opportunity to create cultural, social, etc., amenities. Use bonusing if it can be done consistently and fairly.

- Mr. Boname referred to the Art Gallery open space on Georgia as being too small. He said he wished we had a Union Square (like San Francisco). Need a physical sense of presence in the heart of the core. Robson Square is still tangential and lineal. Need an open "bull's eye" in the midst of the street grid.

- Regarding retail, what's important is:

    - Contiguousness; and
    - Strategic location of larger components, e.g. the traffic-generators.

  I am a very strong advocate of concentric and contiguous development - development in terms of retail land use. I have a general anathema toward the evolution of pockets of traditional or conventional retail development in downtown areas. City Planning could anticipate the probability of new department stores and additional retail facilities, in downtown areas and act to precipitate private sector activity in desired locations. Do early planning and, if necessary, involve other levels of government. For Portage Place in Winnipeg, each level of government had a 1/3 interest in the land assembly and provided the subsidy required to

get the private sector to respond. Otherwise retail can go else where and split downtown with diverse negative impacts. Creation of another node will be a problem. It won't be a problem at Pacific Place; they're not proposing too much retail, particularly of a conventional variety.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Gerald Hamilton

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : June 22, 1988

PLACE : Office of Hamilton Doyle Kwan

- Since then (1975) we have had this neighbour-friendly attitude which is fantastic, here to stay. It has taught all architects to work harder - more work has been expected. It has been expensive. The only rider on my enthusiasm is the fact that maybe once the Urbanarium is in and we have some tool that can computerize the view angles and the shadows and all that, I think the industry is going to benefit then by cutting down the cost.

- Other than that, the downtown has moved according to the market and I advise the Planning Department not to think in any other terms except market-driven force to create the sort of city we are going to become, together, of course, with urban design features which are in the public interest.

- Now we have the uncertainties and that is why the Composite Committee is meeting and at the end of the year. There should be no more uncertainties and every body should know where they are going. By that I mean that we will have a composite matrix of livability factors.

- (Interviewer's question: About the uncertainties that you mentioned - are you talking about land use uncertainties in the sense of not knowing if something is residential or commercial and/or are you referring to discretionary zoning uncertainties?)

  Both.

- My feeling is that the greatest opportunity lies in Downtown South - it is brand new - and that you can radiate from it some rationale on density and on heights and on sun penetration and on road infrastructure and maybe from it we can rationalize certain things. From it we can also judge mixed development vs. pure office development and pure residential.

Gerald Hamilton

- Right now somebody mentioned a very good term and that is that the West End is actually a suburban residential development within the central core. That is interesting when you compare it with the other adjoining urban residential stock within the same area and I think time will tell how that works out. Whether the densities should be increased or decreased is something that we hope to come to grips with.

- Street life is something we should concentrate on in the next little while as to an understanding of what makes good street life, what will actually produce for the people who choose to be downtown, the kind of ambience that they want.

- Density pours people out on the street and we have to look at the social aspects of it. It is all very well when you have rich people who go into the expensive towers and then they have their own environment but the streets are public and we have certain social elements to consider like people who are paying certain rates and like to be where they are and don't want to have the development pry them loose and then they have to find somewhere else when maybe we shouldn't force them to and that is one reason for Ald. Price's look at down-zoning certain areas rather than up-zoning.

- Look into where street walls actually can succeed. It only works when you have residential above shops, which means rentals, I suspect.

- I do agree with a high-rise system giving us more penetration and protecting more views. I am against the whale type of structure that sits across the site except where I mentioned certain places for the street walls: Robson, Granville and parts of Davie Street. The densities generally, I think, are okay. Why don't we build higher towers? We might as well and keep people so that there is a higher utilization of what is on the ground floor.

- (Interviewers question: Are there terrific economies of scale as you go up?)

  Not really. If you get views people pay you well for them. Certainly to have a city that is squished down like Ottawa in order to see the Parliament it makes for very poor accommodation. The people don't like it. I quite like Point Towers (as everybody knows) but I like (them) for these reasons - that people are more comfortable and they do expect a view from the city. They will also maintain them better.

Gerald Hamilton

- Using an Urbanarium model, buildings should be placed in a good juxtaposition and then everybody is happy. The idea of keeping everything down because nobody then has a view and nobody deserves a view - let's try and get the views!

- (Interviewers question: Do you see the possibility in Downtown South of being able to create affordable housing, low-end of market housing, or middle-market rental housing or will it all be sale?)

  Obviously it depends on the Government Programs...

  (Interviewer's question: No, that is not what I mean - I mean will these economies... is there a possibility of housing people who work in service industries in the downtown core who would like to live in the downtown or nearby but whose wages are not enough to give them luxury accommodation or even middle-market or maybe low-end market. Would it be possible for any of this?)

  Right now, we have been on the brink of affording it - now it is sliding out of our hands again because of land speculation. The trouble is that wages haven't gone up because of the recession. Prices on land came down, construction has come down a little but now it has gone up again because there is an activity. You have got to catch rental accommodation when the land is down and when the construction prices are down and then you can probably afford it and people stretch a little to get into it. The corner of Davie and Howe happened - they bought their land at $55 a sq. ft. (i.e. $11/buildable sq. ft.) and now you can't do that anymore.

- If you want, as a Commission, to do something serious like getting land ready for proposal calls, I have identified three city blocks that you might have a go at. One city block would be the Larwill Park Bus Station; you build rental accommodation above there and sink the bus station down.

  Another site is block 56 - the Federal block which is not now being contemplated to be used.

  A third possible one is that you go back to Pacific Concord and say - Hey, you'll be a long time before you build the North Park area for anything that is market-driven - so sell us back a part of that at $11 - $12 a buildable and we will go and build some rental apartments. Then you have to decide what density you put on it. I suspect from there, for rental, you may have to go a slightly higher density. I am against subsidized housing except for the poor because too many non-poor seem to find themselves in those.

Gerald Hamilton

(Interviewer's question: And yet you are favouring co-ops?)

Well yes! Co-ops for ordinary people like you and me. You might be my neighbour down the corridor.

- We need a matrix which ties everything together and makes sense. There has to be a rationale from Marathon over to Concord and that we don't have. That is number one. In order to do that you have to dispose of the view thing once and for all. The views from the bridges we all agree with, the other view angles - it has to be dealt with first and then we can do the matrix between us and then we have to settle this philosophical questions of central core towers for some and air penetration vs. street walls. Street walls should be decided as to where they should be downtown.

- The City should immediately give great support on the BIA Program.

- Also get rid of the bonus thing. I will give you an example: One hour ago we were discussing the site where Tony Roma is - that is 2 + 2 + 2. Now, what are we to tell the client what should be applied for? We want to build a residential building. Now, what density please tell me?

  That is my very best example and it is a decision I have to make in the next 10 days, how to apply. Who is going to tell me? Nobody knows!

- The other thing is the C3A.

- Design is something that we are happy to change when somebody feels strongly. I am talking about land use.

- We don't want to see two downtowns created, one where it is and one down on the Concord project.

- We now know more about retail success and why it happens on Robson Street, we need more Social Planning input on street life. Alderman Price is very, very strong about where we put the hookers and the street elements. If we do some planning with that in mind, they won't pop up by surprise but rather they will feel comfortable in some area where the night clubs are going to be and even where some residential accommodation is where they can take their customers off the street.

Gerald Hamilton

After doing the things I have already said, I'd like to see a real understanding of street life and forget about density as a danger or height as a danger but rather let the towers go up provided that the street life consistency is just right.

- We must address downtown parking. It is becoming a problem again, especially around Pacific Centre. It has reached crisis proportions.

- (Interviewer's question: The infrastructure that you were mentioning (and with high-density) that the City will have to supply, do you see a linkage where the development community has to pay into a fund which would purchase a mini park or... in other words the City and the development community go together to create these communities that are livable?)

  Yes, Davie between Seymour and Richards. don't make it public because the price will go up. Maybe the transit can go underneath it and then you have to park on top. Wherever the transit is going to come that will make Downtown South into a place that means something.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW:		Paul Merrick
WITH	:	Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard
DATE	:	June 22, 1988
PLACE	:	Paul Merrick's Office

(Unfortunately the tape broke during this interview, so instead of a verbatim transcript we have Ronda's notes)

To answer our questions of how the Central Area has changed and is changing, Paul got out two maps: One, a current aerial photo of the Central Area, and the other a sketch concept map he had prepared 18 years ago during False Creek discussions. Some of the main points he made were:

- While mixed use buildings (housing over shops) have been resisted by the market, there has been an increasing mix and juxtapositon of uses: i.e. within the proximity of the Central Area as a whole, there are more uses even if they are not in mixed use buildings per se.

- The CBD remains and will remain compact, although it is being re-established on the water with the building of Canada Place and the proposed Marathon development. This provides more amenity for the CBD. The CBD will grow east along the Skytrain route too. This is an alternative to growth which otherwise might have occurred in the Downtown South or Golden Triangle. The importance of face-to-face interaction will not be replaced by technology. Generally, the CBD wants to be a cohesive area.

- Development (residential and commercial) occurs near amenities. Thus the West End has the "hole in the donut" (i.e. low density development) in its middle where it is away from park and water. Downtown South particularly is an area that needs amenity if it is to develop. Impost fees could make sense.

- The future will see transit all around False Creek. Existing rail lines are valuable corridors for future transit.

Paul Merrick

- Views drive buildings higher. Given any constant density, the lower the building is, the fewer views there are. Higher buildings provide more view expanse for more people. Livability can be achieved at densities higher than 3.0 (no upper limit was proposed).

- Increasingly, the population of our city will be younger and from other urban places. They will be willing to trade-off single-family living for the vitality and convenience of higher density living.

- The Port land north of Gastown will eventually be low rise residential.

- Livability of higher density buildings has been increasing over the years. More private outdoor space is provided (square balconies instead of rectangular) and more multi-exposures.

- Much of the change over the past 15 - 20 years has been in an expected direction. The most unexpected element has been the rapid pace of the change.

- The most critical issue for downtown Vancouver for the future is the public realm. We know how to zone, manage, and build large, quality individual projects. But we as a City do not deal with the street very well. The public realm is not just utilitarian; it is also an amenity (i.e. Denman Street is an amenity to the West End, just as park and water are). There must be recognition of the street as part of the community's living room. This goes beyond beautification, to include outdoor street cafes and outdoor displays.

- The symbolic public realm critical issue is that "the curbs are too high". This prevents co-occupancy of the streets as in Granville Island.

Our discussion occurred in a second floor office facing into Gaolers Mews. It is a very charming, old style, closely-packed internal courtyard containing small shops, restaurants, and offices. We could see not only the courtyard with its activity and greenery, but also a bit of sky, as the buildings surrounding the courtyard are only three or four stories high. Joyce instigated a discussion of whether such a mews could be in the middle of a block which contained high rise residential towers. Paul agreed there could certainly be high towers at corners. He pointed out that this form of development could be better achieved with lane closures to make more appropriately shaped development sites than the long, narrow block frontages created by the lane system.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Cornelia Oberlander

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : June 23, 1988

PLACE : Ms. Oberlander's home

- The problem of having high-density development and vegetation on the street is very hard to reconcile because you can only grow certain types of trees with the shadow pattern you are getting from high office or residential blocks. Then there is the question who will design the streetscape? We have nobody in City Hall right now who is an urban arborist. These are experts on what grows in a city.

- When I am talking about a streetscape I am talking about greenery and nobody has imitated us at Robson Square and there you have what is needed. Streets that are linkages between the various uses (residential and office) that can go east and west and they're the pedestrian transportation systems which we need in the city.

  You would have this wonderful feeling of greenery and you use a tree that has a high trunk so people can look into the shops.

- We showed how nicely you can have parks on roofs of buildings through Robson Square. I suggest that the street and then the roof top must be green at various levels on the high-rise. For instance you use level six - that would be 20 metres up - that would allow you to have a green space like on the Pan Pacific Hotel. There is a whole roof garden there and that roof garden could be linked to another office tower on the other side with a green walkway so you are using the air rights for linkages. Those linkages could also have shops on them like the Ponte Vecchio in Florence. Georgia Street, for example, could become a green street with planted roof areas on the setbacks and bridges across. These would be a part of the urban pedestrian system, as well as visual pleasure.

- (Interviewer's question: Are you concerned at all that if we had different levels of pedestrian systems say at ground level and a level above that it would dilute the street activity in any way?)

  If you are talking about the high population densities, then you need a hierachy of green spaces downtown and developers must provide for these green spaces. You have to work this out with some sort of bonus.

That would not just be the towers that were presented in George Baird's report but they would have setbacks and they would be green like Robson Square and there would be bridges from one side of Georgia Street to the other so that people could communicate and not just on the ground floor because the ground floor will be mostly for cars. That is how I see that. The communication takes place on the 6th floor or something like that. It is probably lethal what I'm saying.

The Smithe Street Bridge is a bridge over Smithe Street to link the Provincial Government complex with the Court House; that kind of bridge is absolutely magnificent.

- o I visualize that we have the pedestrian, that we have the linkage due to the light rapid transit (that is another one) and that we have also a bus system maybe between new areas on the downtown peninsula because I can't quite see any of this in isolation.

- o (Interviewer's question: Do you think that greenery can play a big role in making streets that don't have a lot of shops on them into streets that a pedestrian feels comfortable on?)

  Yes I do. I think it can be done with landscape materials and also different pavings, lights etc. - it could be very exciting.

- o They have redone the Eatons plaza (at Georgia and Granville) with very expensive paving and marble planters, and very expensive street furniture and little greenhouse kiosk-type. There are so many things on one street corner that you don't know where to look first and in that small space they have three different types of trees - I mean how could you?

  Those things don't read. Why do you think Hornby and Howe looks so nice? One type of tree. Why do you think the planter boxes look so nice? One type of plant in the planter boxes. Could these streets be meaningful? Yes they could be meaningful by the spacing of trees and choice of plant material, as well as street furniture. Such a streetscape could give you enjoyment while strolling on Sunday. You don't have to go to the park. Livable streets is something where, for instance, in Europe they close off the street at times and let the children play in the street because children love that. Maybe we should also think about the Sunday use of the street.

Cornelia Oberlander

- (Interviewer's question: Are there street trees that could give you almost weather protection?)

  Yes.

- Looking at the model of Pacific Place I found, first of all, not enough linkages between the city and the boundaries of theirs and secondly, I do not find a concept, an overall concept of the green spaces. The green spaces at Pacific Place are too far north - they are at the north end of the Creek. The north end of the Creek is so contaminated that I doubt that trees will grow there. What is needed here is a broad concept of urban open space system; such as the one in Boston designed by Olmsted over 100 years ago.

- (Interviewer's question: If the City had a great aborist, what are some the chief obstacles that person would run into?)

  The City's Engineering Department. The size of trees, the root systems that they do not like and so the choice of trees for our street would be very limited but he would take good care of everything.

- Before you think about green spaces and linkages, you have to make a matrix and think about what you are using these spaces for.

  First concept and then a matrix of what each area is used for; that is the system by which you must proceed.

  I go very scientifically through it. I have the common name and the botanical name, then the origin of the tree, the size when planted, the size when matured, the growth rate, the shape, the permeability of light and the permeability of rain is important, environmental tolerance, ozone tolerance, hardiness zone, maintenance requirements, special effects.

- I want movable chairs in one of the park areas at the National Gallery which is much better than having fixed benches.

- (Interviewer's question: If you have a street that was not going to attract retail, at least in the foreseeable future, would there be any merit in asking the designer to provide courtyards and recessing?)

Cornelia Oberlander

Yes. Little courtyards, little recesses. Many years ago I designed a little recess at Haro Park on Bute Street at Haro. This allows people to pull back from the street and watch passers-by.

- I think your topic should be livable streets.

- You should research livable streets and you should talk about what has been done in other places. I know we are Vancouver but we can learn a lot. The place we can learn a lot from is Battery Park City in New York. The Battery Park master plan establishes the principle that Battery Park City's streets, parks and buildings should be as much a part of Lower Manhattan as possible. We want that also. To achieve this, the layout and orientation of Battery Park City is an extension of Lower Manhattan and consists of conventional street level blocks bounded by streets and parks. It is so fantastic. The broad esplanade is beautiful and alcoves are beautiful and people can go jogging there and everything. I recommend you all to go and see it.

- Art in public places is very important.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW:	Graham Murchie
WITH:	Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard
ALSO PRESENT:	Lee Tan, Manager of Development Services Eleanor Atienza, Planner
DATE:	July 6, 1988
PLACE:	Surrey City Hall

- From south Surrey, half the population is commuting. At least half the families have a commuter... mainly to downtown and Richmond.

- From my perspective as a newcomer to the region, it looks like you're doing everything right in downtown Vancouver, in terms of what it looks like and the overall planning, but obviously you're creating an urban environment and a lot of people don't want an urban environment. That's what they tell us when we try to put "urban" down in south Surrey.

  If they want to go to Granville Island, great, but they don't want to live in the West End, and yet their children are living in the West End because there are no high rises in south Surrey; probably for lots of other reasons too. So there is a kind of push-pull and obviously you've been pushing people out because, I think, of land values and the cost of housing and so on which is very obvious but also because you're building an urban environment and not everybody wants that.

- (Interviewer's question: Do you have any sense of to what extent that cost of housing pushes people out to the suburbs; do people choose Surrey because Vancouver is so expensive?)

  I think that's the case. I really do. I think that's happening to a lot of people.

  (Eleanor Atienza: And maybe this alternative is getting more and more appealing, too. There's a lot of new development, for example, both a half acre development and urban development which is good quality, especially in south Surrey.)

Graham Murchie

In terms of the efficiency of the whole region it's less efficient to have that happening but with the pressures on the land market I don't know how you can do anything to make housing affordable. I mean, I went through the exercise of looking for a place. I didn't want to rent. I decided I wanted to settle down, and couldn't... you could rent reasonably in the West End, but you can't buy.

o (Interviewers question: Is Vancouver doing things that are perceived to be hurting the chances of the town centres?)

Yes. In two areas, I think. Transportation, where you're not doing anything, or it's not apparent to us.

You know in terms of the efficient operating of downtown alone, you've got to have the connections as more and more people are tied into the downtown. I mean, our downtown, our regional town centres are never going to compete with the higher order functions that downtown provides so people are still going to have to get into downtown Vancouver, so those transportation connections are really critical. If the linkages are more efficient then the people that can conduct their business in a lower order centre are going to do that and that's bound to help us.

o I guess the second area where there is harm being done is in the overbuilding of office space downtown. We have major players who are leaving here and going downtown.

Now mind you, we don't really have the kind of quality space that even, say, Burnaby has in terms of office space because we're still in transition from a suburban commuter area to really getting a bit of a town centre environment.

o To clarify more on the topic of transportation, I think theory says that the greater the interconnectivity between the nodes, the greater everybody will benefit, but having said that I don't know whether the benefit initially accrues to you or whether it accrues to us. I think in terms of regional efficiency, it's got to be better for all of us because of energy consumption, people's time and so forth.

I guess our sense is that the decentralization of downtown functions isn't working to the extent the livable region plan said it would. No one expects Vancouver to cut off their nose to spite their face, but you know there probably are functions that can be as well done

out here, but until people realize that it's easy to get out here or easier to get out here they're not going to conceive of this as a possibility and think in terms of the functioning of the region. I really do believe it's to everybody's advantage to improve the transportation system. If only in the fact that the commuters, the labour supply that Vancouver depends on. We've got 200,000 people here which means that that's a labour market of about 70,000 workers, and let's say probably 40,000 are commuters into Vancouver so that's 40,000 people that are going to be more attractive employees if you like, more available employees if they can get in and out faster.

(Lee Tan: As for shopping, we are constantly talking about dollars leaking out of Surrey into Vancouver. You see, so far our only major shopping area really is the Guildford Shopping Mall which, I think is still the biggest in B.C. But for people that are commuting from the south into Vancouver, they're just as likely to shop in Vancouver and get a higher order type of shopping than to come home and get in the car and then drive up to Guildford which is a 20 minute ride from south Surrey.

Also, more people are commuting because of Sunday shopping now. Probably combine their trip to Granville Island, enjoy the market then go downtown to do a little shopping.)

- Regarding tourism, I think there's been general agreement at GVRD - I sit on the Technical Advisory Committee - that we (we meaning the non-Vancouver communities) have not capitalized on the people being drawn to Vancouver. You know I don't know if anybody offers, or if it has even been suggested that they offer some kind of a tourist package that will allow you to do some of the things in the suburbs (like White Rock and Crescent Beach) as well as downtown.

  And as part of our south Westminster plan, we've looked at things like public access to the Fraser industrial waterfront and parks and so on, so a few things are beginning to happen but it's greatly under-utilized possibility.

- I would like to see an area in downtown Vancouver where there is more happening late in the evening. I realize that Granville Mall was supposed to do that but all it does is, it's great if you want to buy drugs I suppose, but it scares away other interaction.

Graham Murchie

o The other area where I think that somehow the boat has been missed is around English Bay where I could see having nice little cafes with being able to sit out under an umbrella. Denman Street doesn't address the Bay at all. It happens that it ends up running into the Bay.

I think of some of the cities along the Mediterranean, where you've got your high-rises and you've got your activity on the street with little sidewalk cafes and so on.

In False Creek you're looking at the muddy waters of False Creek but English Bay is absolutely ideal, no question.

o (Lee Tan: A lot of people like to play golf and it's practically impossible now to get a tee off time in Vancouver at any of the golf courses in Vancouver.

So I think we in Surrey have potential to offer things to the tourists that Vancouver may not be able to offer and we don't necessarily want to compete with Vancouver, but we want to provide things that will complement what Vancouver has to offer.

I know a lot of Japanese tourists who come to Vancouver. They want to go sightseeing, everybody does that, the first time. But apart from that, they come to shop and to play golf. Many of the tourists head straight for the University golf course because that course has now, apparently, changed their policy and they're going openly for the Japanese visitor, the golfer. They have increased their green fees and that has effectively put a damper on the local golfer.)

o I think very few people moved out from downtown Vancouver to Surrey to live. We have been able to attract some ex-Vancouverites out to live here but these people probably moved from residential neighbourhoods because you get better value for your money in terms of the house. Those who live in downtown Vancouver, West 10th for instance, or Fairview Slopes, they live there by choice. They don't want to move to Surrey. So I don't think we have too many ex-West Enders in Surrey.

It probably works the other way around. They have grown up as teenagers here and have moved down there. Or, like some of the empty nesters have left here and gone to Vancouver, although I'm sure there's probably more coming the other way.

Graham Murchie

- Downtown, to a Surrey resident, it still very attractive. You've got certain assets with which there's no comparison, like Stanley Park and English Bay. Shopping is a minor attraction; I think people go more for specialized shopping, to Chinatown or to Granville Market. Most downtown stores you can also find in a suburban mall.

  Normally, anybody going to shop downtown Vancouver would probably combine that trip with something else, going to English Bay or going to dine in some restaurant, because Vancouver has that, good dining places.

- Downtown Vancouver's entertainment and night-life district tends to be diffused and there isn't a district. Granville Mall is probably, it has the theatres at least, but doesn't have very much else. I mean you wouldn't want to eat in any of those restaurants there. Maybe just getting the residential development in that area is going to revitalize the mall. Maybe that's the answer, you just need more people living there.

  Something is going on on Granville Island, there's something going on on Hornby Street, a little bit in Gastown; it's all scattered. And of course, as soon as you designate an area as a district, bingo, the property goes up, so they end up going to the edge of the district or across the line, so you're going to have that problem, but..

  Maybe that whole area to the east of Granville with the CBC in there, you've got quite a few restaurants down there, you've got a few discos, so maybe that becomes the entertainment district.

- I have some real personal peeves about parking. Like, why can't you park in commercial alleys after the stores are closed?

- (Lee Tan: What downtown Vancouver needs is a people-mover in the downtown area, as Miami has. Miami has a very good system now and even Seattle. You know in Seattle in the downtown area you can ride busses free, within the core area.

  So you can encourage people to leave their car. Maybe certain people will drive, not into downtown but leave their car on the fringe and hop on a bus or whatever. Some form of people mover, and then go to all the high spots. You may even touch all the spots.)

Graham Murchie

- I have to believe making it easier for people to get to and from downtown is going to help Vancouver. I don't know that it's going to help us very much, but I think in the long-term health of the region, it's got to help, it's going to probably speed up that sorting out of higher order functions.

- I see ALRT as analogous to the BART system in San Francisco; it's really to connect the town centres, it's not to solve your downtown problems. It's really our downtown problem because we all go down there.

  We could call busses "people-movers" and they're painted one colour and it's a fixed route, so you don't have to know whether you need a 61 or a 27, you know. There are buses probably running the whole route now but nobody knows unless you live in the West End and you use them.

- If you took some of that Expo parking and you ran a shuttle bus down those routes. I mean, I could show you the routes right now, up through the new entertainment district, past the mall, down Robson Street, down Denman and up Davie and back to the parking lot. You've got it right there.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Larry Bell

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : July 14, 1988

PLACE : B.C. Hydro Building

---

o I've been extraordinarily impressed with the care that you're taking right now. I really must say, I guess I just wasn't aware, the things that you worry about. Your planners indicated that the blank wall we created was not conducive to an attractive downtown and I agree with you completely! So, I must say I'm very impressed with the kind of care, and I see some of the open spaces and plazas and that sort of thing that are created with these new buildings and there's a real tangible return for that care you take.

o I think corporate headquarters - Hydro - needs to be downtown. There's all sorts of reasons why, but my computer division is on the other side of that wall. It's like a blue wall of a bunker that ruins that streetscape down there.

o The people who would be in corporate headquarters: They will be very senior staff people and even the secretaries and clerical group involved in here would be very much at the high end of that pay grade.

o Our real concern is with respect to this building. It is just an old fashioned building. Fortunately we got a lot higher density than today's rules will allow so it keeps the economics in line in the sense of opportunity costs, so the building economics will always preserve the building. Nonetheless, this is a very inefficient building for our staff and I think that's the thing that's bothered us more than anything else, it's not the location (outside the CBD).

o But in thinking about that export corporation, I would locate it outside of this building.

(Interviewer's question: You mean, to be down in the Triple A area where everybody else is?)

Yes, I would. The Board of Trade is down at Pan Pacific, The World Trade Centre, they're trying to create some momentum there to get some focal point for people who have an international focus, and the

government, until recently at any ate, was doing the same thing with the Expo lands. Two sites competing and you've got to decide where you want your focal point and then reinforce it. In my mind, for my export corporation, I'd rather be in the Pan Pacific.

- I think the question of a smart building is upon us. I think someone said that the electrical consumption in new office buildings in Boston per cpaita is about 30% greater than in the old buildings. So I do think that you're going to see a migration of people to the buildings where they can really remain a modern corporation. I wouldn't build another building, I'd lease it. I'd lease it for something like ten years. That's my technology horizon. It's an interesting thought to think that through and really go to some developers and say, with your building what are you putting in it, what do you think about its life cycle, its retrofitting and what you're doing to defend yourself against technological obsolesence. I could go down there and be the prestigious tenant and they'd call it the Hydro Building and ten years later I'd say well, look fellas, I can't run my computers here without a bunch of hassle and workmen every other day.

- (Interviewer's question: We've been told by some economists or geographers that Vancouver will just continue to grow slowly, incrementally, because it's a nice place to live and if we play our cards right we can maintain that growth but that there's no exponential leap.)

  From an academic point of view I tend to agree but where are the drivers? On the other hand, just travel the world a little bit and see the quality of the life that other people have - it's terrible! We're just more and more footloose, in the intellectual and information game. If they knew about any alternative and had any command of their life in terms of location while maintaining their ownership or management they will locate in Vancouver. Technology is just making that more and more possible.

- (Interviewer's question: What footloose industries do you see that we should be catering to or hoping for, or the possibilities that they want to locate here?)

  It's just a lot of individual decisions. So the kind of things that I think are attractive are where we start to generate focal points. If we had a building that was for exporters. If we had a building that was for people who, all over the world had some reputation around technology or mining or management of mining or something.

Larry Bell

You've got to create that visibility somehow, otherwise you're tucked in the file drawer.

- (Interviewer's question: What is it that you think makes it so livable here and so awful in other places?)

  We've got the physical beauty and obvious climatic advantages and so on, but I think the uncrowded nature of downtown. We'd want to be very careful not to get too high a density. It may be beautiful but if you're being pushed and shoved it's still a struggle. I think it is also the outdoor public places and it's the sense of physical security.

  (Interviewer's question: What creates the right level of activity without creating the struggle you define. Do you have any reactions?)

  I think that's the art form, I really do. That's your challenge and a significant one in my mind. I don't have a sense that in a residential area you run that risk so much as in the downtown area. If you go down Robson on a nice day at noon, you're getting close.

- Transportation: I think your strategy of creating living space downtown, I think that's really a sustainable strategy. It'll be upscale but the jobs are going to gravitate upscale too.

- It doesn't upset me that people have to pay a lot for parking, they ought to pay for it, for creating that congestion on the streets, that's the only way to deal with it.

- Make it easy to walk. I mean, I walk everywhere and I find it delightful.

  (Interviewer's question: Would you include weather protection in that?)

  Yes, I think I would actually. If I was to think about transportation in the downtown I'd say, let's make darn sure we can walk around it. To get here to the downtown and to get back, the car is inevitable and it's the freeway problem and that peak. The Lion's Gate Bridge would be the same if you had four of them.

Larry Bell

o (Interviewer's question: You touched on something when you said that we don't have bag ladies going for warmth in lobbies. Would you say this is important, that the low end of our society is much better and compassionately housed and cared for than in other cities, and that that's something we should maintain as a public policy?)

Intuitively I believe that, I really do, and perhaps that's the difference.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Ron Longstaffe

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : June 21, 1988

PLACE : Lignum Offices

- It seems to me that the downtown core has expanded, that it now, in terms of business communities, begins to carry you down towards the Westcoast Transmission building and the Bayshore, which 15 years ago, I don't know if Westcoast Transmission was there yet but the Bayshore was, but there was a big gap in between. When I first got involved with the Vancouver Art Gallery in its old location, one of the problems that we had was it was just that extra block and a half too far away. The way we've moved south toward Davie Street was considered on the outer fringe. Fifteen years ago you would have said that it was well beyond the downtown core. More office buildings shifted down that way, you are getting a small community around St. Paul's Hospital. Now we see what has happened I suppose with B.C. Place, and now with the B.C. Expo we think of downtown as encompassing all of that, so I think it has expanded. And now with Pan Pacific and 200 Granville you have gone to the outer limits of your norm.

- Secondly, I think that what you clearly have now is a centre to the City. I think that the Art Gallery and the two blocks behind has given the downtown core a true rallying point. If we had it before in part we have sort of buttoned it down and formalized it in a rather attractive way.

- We certainly have a number of very attractive office buildings. If you go up Burrard Street you have what I call the Daon Building, then you have the Commerce, then you have Manulife which is a disaster and then you have the YWCA, and then you have Park Place which I think is another fine building. I am very strong on the potential of aesthetics that don't add that much to the costs and sometimes don't add any, but in terms of the appeal, that's really attractive. Those sorts of values last 50-100 years.

- I have travelled a fair amount and one of the things that always gets me about Vancouver is that it has a lively vibrant downtown core on the whole and I think that that is an important accomplishment and I think that it is worth maintaining. All you have to do is go to cities like Dallas or Houston to appreciate what

you have downtown. You have got a good mix downtown - you have good retail from the anchor stores, the Bay, Eaton's, a very successful mall to the Robson Street development, and the Art Gallery, and there is no other art gallery with the possible exception of the National Gallery in London, that is at the core of the city. It is fairly rare and with your atriums and what you can do on New Year's Eve and the Orpheum and the things in that area - it opens up all sorts of potential for creative entrepreneurial people to which obviously the public is giving response. I think we have made tremendous progress.

- The top merchan's of Vancouver basically have not located on the Granville Mall so I don't know what the original thought was but whatever it was, it has not worked and I don't think that it is ever going to work. I find that I can go literally a year without walking along the Granville Mall. I may cross it but I wouldn't walk 3 blocks of it. I basically go from one year to the next without being on it. There is no reason to be on it. I can go to the Orpheum by the other door.

- There are some people who feel, whether for prestige or whatever, that they have to be in the downtown core and will pay the high rents to be compacted. I know of a number of businesses who want to be on the fringe of the downtown core in Schedule B buildings. They do that to keep their overhead down plus they don't want the perception that they have high overheads. Hence it has gone into something that is maybe four blocks off the beaten path and they find that it is worthwhile. What we are finding with communications these days and the FAX you can do a lot more. I have literally had 6-hour meetings on a speaker phone and you know the parties - they may be in Toronto, New York, London (England) and it doesn't matter, you just do your business so I think that that has implications for - do you really have to be in the downtown core? I think that you can be on the fringe and still walk four blocks once or twice a day or maybe take a cab.

- One of the problems with downtown and I guess that it has always hit me wrong about the Planning Department years ago is that they were trying to restrict the amount of parking. It is very hard to talk a North American out of using his car.

The Cambie Street Bridge was a major achievement.

Ron Longstaffe

- Vancouver is one of those spots that people want to see once in their lifetime. In the normal course of events I think it is going to grow. It is going to grow even if it is just for lifestyle. I would like us to give high emphasis to good design in buildings. If you look out the window here where the Burrard Street Metro Station is, there is a park there and that was part of the deal with the Bentall Centre and with Bo McLean. That is very congenial in the middle of downtown with all these high-rises. I would like to see fairly good design with some breathers from the density. I do think set-backs and open spaces add to the quality of the city enormously.

- I hope they protect the skyline on the Marathon project. I hope that they don't take away all of our views.

- Granville Island is really quite successful and attractive and it adds to the whole flavour. Granville Island is almost an extension to where downtown is going. We really are blending into each other. The downtown is blending into some nice specialty areas with their own character and flavour such as Yaletown, Gastown and Granville Island, Robson Street and then across Granville Street Bridge and you are on the South side of False Creek. The downtown core is getting natural satelites of distinctive flavour and characteristics.

- (Interviewer's question: Are those kind of improvements, like small parks - are those the kinds of things that attract corporations to a city?)

  Whether they consciously put a price tag on it I don't know. Over time, the payback is there. If I were in development I would resist you, so I guess if I were the City I would lean on the developer and say - That is the cost of doing it.

- I do have a concern, as we go ahead, about us being over-retailed. I think we have far too much retail for merchants to survive. My sense is that we have far more retail than we really need and not only that, we have expanded the hours. I don't know the answer to your question of whether the City should say we have got enough already, we will protect what we have got and make it a little harder. It is not an open and shut case.

- (Interviewer's question: Is it generally the case that people in the prestige office core feel that they don't want to look out on a residential building next door, that it somehow lowers the prestige that is so important to the economic vitality of this type of business district?)

Ron Longstaffe

I have never thought about it but you put the question to me that way and I would say yes. I wouldn't get terribly excited about it but if you asked me my preference I'd say yes.

- I just think they (Art Gallery) are very fortunate to have such a marvelous location. I do think the Planetarium has been greatly disadvantaged by being in a park outside the downtown core. Even though there is good parking around there, I think it has hurt their attendance. If you are out of the way, you have to be ever that much better in order to draw people. It is one of my concerns at the Science World - as long as they are there all by themselves, even though they've got the skytrain nearby, you have to go there specially. It isn't something you can just drop into, in the neighbourhood. I think it is a disadvantage (the site) in the short term until developments go up around it.

- This is anecdotal more than analytical. Bill Reid is located down in Granville Island and you can see his studio through the window. You walk by - you can see what he is doing. They apparently gave him very reasonable rent for him to be there with his workshop provided he was prepared to be a bit of a tourist attraction. I thought that made a lot of sense. If I were to walk along Granville Mall, which I don't but if there was a dance studio etc. and that was part of the image, I think I'd like it.

  We will always be the headquarters for major B.C. corporations but it will always be outshot by Toronto and Montreal in terms of national headquarters. Most of your forest resources in B.C. have been committed. I don't see a lot of the new forest company head offices developing in Vancouver. I think you are going to see B.C. Forest Products and Crown all, in 5 years, one company. Instead of 2 head offices there is going to be one so you are more likely to have rationalization rather than growth.

- The fine arts never attracted major corporate wealth in Vancouver. Instead, the money went to places like the Bloedel Conservatory, van Deusen Gardens and U.B.C.

- A grand boulevard is missing e.g., University Avenue in Toronto.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW:		Peter Saunders
WITH	:	Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard
DATE	:	August 31, 1988
PLACE	:	Office of Saunders Investments

This was a brief interview and rather than complete a full typed transcript from the tape, the following is a summary of Mr. Saunder's points:

- He is concerned about lack of parking downtown.
- He likes underground connections for retail, because of the weather protection provided.
- Drainage has gotten worse. Downtown intersections collect several inches of water which pedestrians must step into when crossing the streets, and they get splashed by passing cars.
- Downtown's cleanliness is unique and a real asset.
- Bicycle couriers are "out of control". This includes not only their driving, but also their loud, blaring walkie-talkies in office elevators.
- Bicycles generally are interferring with the traffic flow, especially on the most major streets. They are vying for space with cars.

After these preliminary points we asked Mr. Saunders to tell us about "Business and the Arts", an organization established by the previous City Council. Mr. Saunders chairs this group. It has members (low fee plus government subsidies) from business and arts groups. Business members volunteer for a "skills bank". Legal, accounting, insurance, budgeting, and fund-raising are the types of skills provided by business people to arts groups. The organization also had a federal grant to study tourism and the arts, which Mr. Saunders believes is an important interconnection. Vancouver, he says, has relatively few big head offices to contribute large sums to arts, and we are a young city, which also means we have less of an arts tradition. Yet the arts are important for quality of life and attracting business.

We also discussed the idea of a 1% charge on developments for the provision of art. Mr. Saunders thought there might be benefits, but many details would need to be worked out. Also, 1% can be a make-or-break proposition for a development. Bonuses are also an idea.

Peter Saunders

Business and the Arts also worked with the City and the developer to achieve the bonussed amenity lobby in the Bank of B.C. (Bank of Hong Kong) building. They also arrange for artists to show or perform their art in office lobbies or plazas.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : August 17, 1988

PLACE : Ms. Birnie Danzker's home

---

o The key political, economic and social issues facing the City of Vancouver now, and for the next 20 years are essentially cultural.

Issues such as economic domination of the Vancouver property market by Hong Kong entrepreneurs; Sikh terrorism and the Khalistan movement; Japanese Redress; and Indian land claims.

o Depending on how these "cultural" issues are addressed at all levels of our society - in our education policies, in our cultural strategies and institutions, in our Planning priorities, in our political leadership - Vancouver will find itself either a model community or one torn apart by racism, factionalism and possibly violence.

Our long-term strategy or goal should be the active support of a policy of Transculturalism.

Transculturalism has been called the "truth of multiculturalism". Multiculturalism has been little more than a mosaic, a collage. Transculturalism is the active creation of a new culture.

Since the founding of our city (and our cultural institutions), there has been a gap between what our leading artists have struggled to achieve (the creation of a new culture - one of cultural reconciliation) and what our community leaders have established by rule of law or governance.

We are now at the point where that gap must be eliminated and where the City of Vancouver has a leadership role.

o The history of our City and Province has been one of cultural exclusion. The city was incorporated in 1886 - within six months the Chinese workers are being driven from the West End. Twenty years later, the Sikhs are refused permission to land the Komagata Maru. The Japanese have their property seized during the Second World War. The right to vote is denied to second- and even third-generation Chinese until 1947.

Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker

Conventional wisdom is that the 'Period of Exclusion' ended in 1947 with the right to vote. The reality is that Cultural Exclusion exists today - and in the Board Rooms of our cultural institutions. Government and business are more "inclusive" than the management structures of our cultural organizations.

o This sounds a little bit unrelated to what you are doing but I think it is key to any planning decisions for the future. One of the things I tried to do at the Vancouver Art Gallery was to shift the programming and I ran into a lot of trouble. Not the public, but the people at a board level or at the level of the so-called community leaders, which was very surprising. The general public response was very good. We put together a series of exhibitions all on Chinese culture. It was the first one in the history of the Gallery that had been done and we turned over the entire Gallery to the Chinese culture, both contemporary and historical work. This project took me 7 years to organize mainly because of the terrible distance that was felt between the European-based cultural institutions and the Chinese. There was a feeling that the cultural institutions that exist in the city have nothing to do with Chinese culture and that people would be unwelcome. The other thing I did was work with the children from the community. During Expo we had the dragon boat event and we had children come and do traditional Chinese paintings of the dragon boat. We did the same thing with the Japanese community. We had Chinese dances by children. We had Japanese dances by children, etc. What this did was to indicate to the Chinese community that there was a place for them inside the cultural organizations that exist.

o Our leading artists have always directed us towards cultural reconciliation and towards the creation of a unique Transcultural society.

In 1931, The Board of The Vancouver Art Gallery commissioned community leaders to go to Britain to buy art - to establish a collection which would "portray the history and development of British art". At exactly the same time, one of Canada's greatest artists, Emily Carr, was producing her masterworks of cultural reconciliation - drawing on her European heritage and the magnificent monumental culture of British Columbia's indigenous people.

Our artists continue to struggle with the issue of cultural reconciliation and with the creation of a new Transculture.

One example is No No Miya, the new opera recently performed by Judith Forst. Written by a composer from Victoria, No No Miya recounts a much loved tale from the Japanese Noh Theatre.

All these artists draw on traditions of the 'other'.

o Very few of the Boards of cultural institutions in Vancouver have representation from ethnic communities in our City. While some of our Chinese business leaders have recently been invited to serve in such a capacity, I would suggest that they are the exception. To my knowledge there are no representatives from the Sikh community or native Indians on cultural Boards.

It is essential that such representation be established. Because of the very serious potential for racial conflict in our society, I would go as far as making ethnic representation on our cultural Boards a condition for funding.

o I wrote an Acquisitions Policy for the Vancouver Art Gallery which made it the only gallery in Canada to have a policy that says there will be no discrimination on the basis of race and sex - this is only since 1985.

Any art made by a Native Indian is considered to be anthropology and any art made by a white person is considered to be art. One of the things that happened as a result of this policy was that we were able to buy native art for the first time in the Gallery's history (1986). The first exhibition ever, of native art as art, was Arts of the Raven in 1967. There were another two; Sculpture of the Inuit (1971) and Images: Stone B.C. (1975) - these were the key shows.

o Our cultural institutions also suffer from an alarming instability due to what I perceive as an interventionist tendency in our Boards. Public discussion during the Vancouver Symphony crisis isolated many of the key problems - public bickering, internal power struggles, conflict of interest, undermining of public confidence in key personnel.

I see the reconstructed Board (and Task Force) of the Vancouver Symphony as taking strong and effective steps to eliminate these problems. Their actions could well be used as Guidelines for conditions of funding by the City.

Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker

Certainly no organization should be publicly funded unless it has previously set in place Conflict-of-Interest guidelines. Ideally each organization would also have guidelines for resolution of Board conflict, Board/Director conflict and Director/Staff conflict.

There are a number of such documents already in existence in Canada and the U.S. which the City could utilize in drafting their own Guidelines.

The problems faced by the Symphony have been repeated in the Film Festival, Pacific Cinematheque and others. We cannot as a community afford such instability - neither in terms of the waste of taxpayers' money nor in terms of the crucial role these organizations play in

- defining our cultural heritage;
- facilitating cultural reconciliation;
- interpreting cultural heritage to our youth.

These cultural institutions are often the only form of communication between our various communities. They are certainly the only forum for fostering both cultural pride and awareness in the youth of those communities.

o Now we come to what you really want to know, which is physical planning. Part of what is needed whenever planning decisions are made, is that cultural activities should be grouped. The main change in these last fifteen years is that there is a meeting place on Granville Island where natural activity leads to social interaction. That is the key point... I think the problem with Gastown is that as long as you don't have people living there, it dies at 6:00 p.m.

o There are two key components to our City - its Landscape and its Culture-scape. In a sense, we need an easy and democratized access to both.

We do have marvellously free access to parts of our Landscape, to the land, its flora, and to its mountains. We do not all have access to its water which is the privilege, for the most part, of the rich.

The presence of the ferry boats at False Creek, and the Sea Bus, help redress that. I would argue that this could be expanded even further. The water is an important part of our collective, and cultural psyche. The MacDonald's Barge in False Creek provided inexpensive family meals 'on' the water.

Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker

I would like to see a great deal of free or inexpensive access to the water as part of the Concord Pacific development.

I also see the Concord Pacific development as a logical location for providing access to our Culture-scape - whether it is in the creation of Festival space; through art in public places which celebrates either the history of our founding communities or the creation of our new Transculture; through the presence of ethnic restaurants.

This raises another issue - which is the nature of the food available at the concessions on our beaches. A small step, but an important one, would be the recognition of our cultural diversity by making available ethnic foods at the concessions.

- The Sikhs are so visibly different. They don't have the middle-class values of the Chinese or Japanese. They are not so easily integrated. But, they still have a presence here that precedes a lot of the white immigrants. Many of them are from families going back at least 100 years and there needs to be a recognition of their contribution.

  There needs to be a space for the Children's Festival, the Asia Pacific Festival, and for the celebration of diverse cultural communities. There has to be a point of pride and recognition by the whole community of the benefits gained by having the component ethnic groups. It seems from a planning point of view that the Concord Pacific area and particularly up into Chinatown would be ideal.

- I was looking at major cities in the world, in terms of which are the ones that work. While they often have a separation, an uptown and a downtown, each area is always concentrated when you get there and you can walk around. One of the reasons that Granville Island works so well is that there is daytime activity (shopping, eating) and at night there are the restaurants and cultural activities...

  The problem with Broadway is that there is increasingly poor quality housing - expensive and of poor quality. There is also too much of a corridor. I think what is needed are restaurants on the slopes. It is potentially a good area because the presence of the hospital means that there is always the need for restaurants and diverse activities in the evening. I have watched the activity around the hospital - there are nurses, doctors, visitors who have to spend ten hours at a time there who need a break, but there is very little to do in the area.

Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker

- Gastown needs living quarters. I saw the movement of the Diane Farris Gallery out of the area as a problem. she went down there thinking that it was going to be developed and it would have been ideal, a wonderful gallery area. If the other galleries had moved down to her, it is the classic gallery environment, particularly its short walking distance. She has moved and has now gone to South Granville which is developing, but there is still something missing there. Now that Diane has gone from Gastown, the most you can hope for there is that it becomes an architect/designer/photographer area, which is great, but it is a lost opportunity for a coherent gallery area. The problem with Granville is that there are two "corridors" and getting from one gallery to the other often requires driving.

- There is a tremendous need for a smaller theatre/performance/concert space. The community is desperate for it.

- (Interviewer's Question: What about Science World - were you concerned regarding location that it was too far?)

  Yes. There was talk about the Vancouver Museum going there too. I personally, at the time, didn't think that it was that good of an idea. It was an identifiable image but I think that we already have that in the World Trade Centre and any time you don't get a purpose-built building, you end up with terrible problems. I think it is probably costing more money to convert than to start from scratch. I would have ditched the building. In terms of location, with the development of Concord Pacifc, it might be fine.

  It seems to me that the city has one of the most wonderful locations for a variety of cultural activities, and the potential for parking spaces, in Vanier Park. I know that nobody wants to touch it with a 10-ft. pole because the residents are problematic.

  I think the Vancouver Museum building should be pulled down and rebuilt. What I would have done is put the Science and Technology Centre there as well. I would create a permanent space for festivals - there is a lot of space under the bridge where I would put parking. There is currently no transit system there. I would build a corridor outside of the houses so that the traffic doesn't go through the community. Some people use the park, but not nearly as many as the size of the park warrants.

- The best thing the City could do is to buy two buildings in Gastown and to make them available to cultural groups at low rents. It would be one of the best investments the City could make.

Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker

o (Interviewer's Question: We seem to have a number of places that are crying out for ideas and we are wondering if we put that building that was proposed on Granville Street, would that be something that you then couldn't put in Gastown?)

If you want a quick return on your money, I would put it in Gastown. There are two different needs. One is what the City needs and the best place to put it. The other is how do we solve our problem with Granville Street. The quickest response would be to put it in Gastown because of what is already there. You would have your artist-run spaces, galleries, a showcase - people get off their cruise ships and all go down to Gastown. There is still the need for restaurants on the water. You put your building in and 6 months later you will see the impact. If you do it on Granville, on top of spending money to get the building, you have to give special benefits to the people who have businesses there etc. You don't have the infrastructure on Granville Street.

o In 1986, I had a lengthy discussion with the Chinese Vice-Minister for Culture concerning the potentially serious conflict between the values of Mainland China and those of Hong Kong. This conflict is, of course, already evident in China, particularly in the Special Economic Zones such as Guangzhou and Guangdong Province.

I do not see another Cultural Revolution as an impossibility.

At the time, I also raised concerns about the loss of cultural heritage in both China and Hong Kong. We are the recipients of the social disorder which results from loss of cultural values - the youth gangs from Hong Kong.

I believe that the fostering of cultural pride in the youth of our ethnic communities is a key to reducing the social disorder which constantly threatens to disrupt our society.

o The City of Vancouver has taken a leadership role in the linkage of economic and cultural initiatives in the Pacific Rim. I refer to the efforts of both the last and present City Councils in Guangzhou and Yokohama. I also refer to the Economic Development Delegation to Los Angeles in 1986 (and to Russia in 1988) which included strong cultural participation.

Such initiatives are not only key to an enlightened trading policy in the Pacific Rim, they are essential to a profound understanding of the cultures which constitute our own social fabric. <u>They are strategies for survival</u>.

Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker

o I would still argue that we are engaged in an experiment which has nowhere else in the world been successfully resolved, and for which Canada is a model. If you look at the only other bi-cultural nation (Belgium), they have basically given up. People look to us as an example of how we can live together. I grew up in Australia and the key reason that I became a national of Canada was because of the racism that I left behind. I decided to be Canadian on the basis that this was a tolerant society based on bi-culturalism and multiculturalism.

o In focussing on our more exotic communities, we often neglect the history and values of our founding cultures from Europe.

I am greatly concerned by the "Cultural Amnesia" which pervades our society, and our preoccupation with what has been termed The Enduring Present. In an obsession with constant re-invention, and an eye to media marketing, we are continually reassured that our cultural institutions are "new", that their activities are the "first of their kind".

Our society requires that its cultural history be written, not denied. This includes our European cultural history and values.

The best cultural history document I have seen of this type is Vancouver Art and Artists; 1931-1983. It describes our cultural history in detail - in art and architecture, in film and photography. It also describes the efforts of those men and women, so nearly forgotten, who shaped our cultural history. In a similar manner, Gum San: Gold Mountain provides a visual record of the history of the Chinese community in Vancouver. (The photographs from this book were presented as a gift from the City of Vancouver to the City of Guangzhou.)

Such documents are all too rare.

o Because we have so many immigrants we have this constant amnesia where we don't remember the people who did things before. When you talk about the host culture, part of the problem is that we don't even have our own history intact. Talk about invisible groups - the Germans are the largest number of immigrants here - where is the history of German immigrants so relevant in this province? Where is the British? Where is the Scottish? How can we have pride in what the development of our community is, if we don't have a knowledge of its history? You can't ask new immigrants to have pride in our values and what we represent when we don't even know what we represent half the time. If we are determined to work for cultural reconciliation a component of that is to develop pride in the Anglo Saxon heritage.

Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker

I do not believe you should reduce grants to large cultural organizations and give the funds to the small. If you bankrupt the large organizations you don't necessarily generate ten equally exciting organizations with the money. Concentration of resources is important. That is against popular wisdom because politically it is more attractive to say we funded twenty organizations as opposed to five.

Art in public places is an important opportunity for multicultural recognition and to celebrate our new Transculture.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Terry Power

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : August 16, 1988

PLACE : City Hall

- I am a sculptor. Most of my work is representational (clay, cement). Aside from being a sculptor I am also a member of ACE (Artists for Creative Environments). We just recently got the by-laws changed to allow for a designation in all the industrial areas and other areas for artists live/work studios.

- In Gastown, since many of the artists are already clustered in that area right now, we are really excited about the idea of helping mix all kinds of activities down there. There are already clubs there, there is a fairly strong tourist component, the buildings lend themselves to studio spaces and a combination of professional live/work studio type accommodations. One of the things that we are really interested in is the idea of the heritage uses/designations being used in some way to provide some incentive for the live/work studios.

- Our hope was that that could be included in a Central Area plan, that there actually would be a designation of a cultural zone and some kind of relaxations built into that to encourage development of the arts community. Heritage is one area we are interested in as far as Gastown is concerned. As far as Granville South is concerned, there seems to be the opportunity to put in the live/work studios as a social housing component, especially in Yaletown.

- Most of the artists do want to be clustered around the downtown core as much as possible. I think that most of us urban artists want to be near what is going on in the city. For example, I am in the Downtown-Eastside which is down along the docks, the Gastown area, and with easy access to the centre of the city. It is a combination of inspiration and also we want to be where it is happening just like everybody else does. It is important for us to be down there [illegible] the urban pulse. It is a business proposition for a lot of us as well. The galleries are there and that is where our livelihood is anyway. We don't want to find ourselves shoved out to say, Surrey, New Westminster, where it is possible that there will be some lower-cost rental spaces, but more or less out of it out there.

Terry Power

- I think that it is good for tourism and for the life of the city overall. Artists in an area of the city make it a more lively area. Artists working in conjunction with professionals such as architects, builders, artists in the club scene, etc. makes for a livelier mix.

- What we have been doing as a group (ACE) for the past year is working on a number of projects that will actually house artists, and our feeling is that there are some workable formulas there for live/work studio projects that would be affordable; they would have a range, of course, but they would generally be affordable. At the moment the group that is helping us is RRAP. The other CMHC doors seem to be closed. We are presently doing a survey with the Social Planning Department which we hope will give some statistics to convince CMHC to look at it again as social housing.

- Actually, we have 3 different projects underway at this point with a couple of other owners looking at the possibilities as well. One ACE project is a warehouse building down on Railway Street - 4 storeys - 34 city units. There is one on Beatty Street which is in the Yaletown area - the same architect is working on that one. The 3rd one is a private development as well, on Hastings Street.

- We have seen one other project like this in the States which interests us. It has gone through completely conventional financing, no subsidies and it is a combination of market rental units on the upper floors and a floor or two of studio space on the lower which are set at a particular price. The difficulty right now is that you can't: seismic relaxations - all those kinds of questions... It seems that developers and building owners would be very eager to hop into something like that whereas now with just the studio spaces it takes a lot of convincing for them to see that there is any kind of return at 40¢ and 50¢ per square foot.

- We are doing a survey and we do have a couple of legal researchers looking into how it has been done in other cities, possibly in the States, etc. We are hoping that we can bring some proposals forward along those lines. Perhaps relaxations or waivers of some of the fees. I don't know exactly, but I know that a lot of the owners in Gastown would go for it just like that. They are just on the edge of going for it and just need a bit of an incentive.

Terry Power

- There really isn't much else to occupy the Gastown buildings. Office seems to be the one that most of the financing agencies look at and right now my impression is that it is not a big thing in Gastown. I know that we have been involved with three different owners in Gastown, so far none of whom have an enormous amount of money to throw around, but they have building spaces: one which was slated to be closed because it was being used by artists and was not upgraded sufficiently, and one that has not been used for 16 years. The interior of the place is incredible.

- Most artists are a little hesitant of the Granville Island kind of concept where it does just sort of gravitate toward retail and large flocks of tourists running through and rather tight constrictions. The thing that we have tried to drill home continually is that we need the kinds of spaces where we can work in private and develop our work. But there is no reason why the products of our work can't be shown and there is no reason why our presence in that community can't be beneficial with the community in many other social ways.

- The ACE group have got a pretty narrow focus in many ways and that could be called housing for artists. We are interested in the individual producers of the work, having the facilities in which to work/live. When I talk about Granville South/Yaletown and the Gastown area, I am thinking about all of the activities that would be generated by the presence of the artists.

- If this by-law package turns out to be successful, if the projects actually do get off the ground and are actual developments, it will be the first time in all of Canada that the live/work studio concept has gotten off the ground. It will probably attract quite a bit of attention.

- I suppose, in some ways, my view of the downtown has changed a little bit. I used to be very much against the skyscrapers - that type of structure. I do enjoy the Downtown-Eastside for what I consider to be a rather chaotic cluster of buildings and activities. I am not particularly happy with the cold and one dimensional type of social housing that you often see. I am quite in awe of some of the larger structures that I see in the city now and I do really appreciate a very innovative design and I am not so much wanting to see every building that might possibly qualify as heritage necessarily having to be saved simply because of that fact. There are some very beautiful concepts in new designs in the tall buildings. I have worked in cement before, so I am very appreciative of some of those big cement spaces.

Terry Power

- The whole idea of art in public spaces in general utilizing the city as a kind of gallery or cityscape... this city is on the verge of doing it, I am sure because it is such a beautiful city and the opportunity is there. I know that if the artists were an active component in any area of the city that you would see more and more of that and not just graffiti either...

- I have gone from being an absolutely reclusive artist down there on the fringes to suddenly realizing that we can play a role in all of this. The changing of the by-laws was the big boost for all of us. We realized that Council was very accessible, City staff made themselves very accessible to us and extremely cooperative. YES - this city is an environment that we take a real part in. We have something to say about it and we feel very strongly about it and very much a part of it.

- I think that anybody who comes to a city is attracted, to a large extent, to the culture of the city. That is a very strong drawing card. For our group just to have the opportunity to have a place to live and work at the moment is basic for us and to some extent, preserving where we already are.

- (Interviewer's question: Can a cultural zone/artists community co-exist well with the image of a new family-with-children community in the Downtown-Eastside? Are those images of the area competing or can they co-exist together?)

  The activity that goes on in Gastown is very separate from what happens three blocks east of that. The Railway Street area, for example, is a little segment all to itself. It is on the fringe of Gastown. Most of the amenities for family and residential seem to be further east. Most of us down there enjoy being in that kind of situation just on the fringe of Gastown where you can plug into all of the energy but at the same time, very close to a very rich mix of people and culture. A lot of the artists are involved in the Carnegie Centre, the Strathcona area, and the Community Gardens.

- Harmons Foundry (Alexander Street) right now is slated to be a social housing for seniors and it is dislocating quite a number of artists who have housing in there and the Foundry as well. Yes, it is true. There are a lot of competing interests down there and we find ourselves colliding with a variety of community interests there too. All of a sudden we are representing the competition in some ways and have to tread very carefully. I like the way they all

co-exist at the moment. It is such an intense little area of the city that one development could make a huge alteration in what goes on. The American Can buildings that are being developed as a design centre - what is that going to do? Nobody knows for sure. Will it be a white elephant sitting on an inappropriate landscape or will it bring more of that kind of stuff into the area? Does it remain dock-side facilities or does it become an extension of the Pan Pacific kind of concept with more tourist-oriented stuff? A matter of two blocks one way or the other could have a major impact on what goes on.

- It is funny, working as a social service aid, I know that a lot of the artists simply do not see the portion of the population of the Downtown-Eastside that I deal with every day. They seem to sit side by side without getting in each other's way.

- I have a tremendous respect for the people who live in the Downtown-Eastside. I think that DERA has done a spectacular job in preserving people's lives as showing respect for the needs of that group. I would hate to see that eradicated . I think the artists on Railway Street certainly fit into it no problem. There are artists all up and down Powell Street, all through Gastown and generally, I think those people have become part of the community overall. It is not a glitzy scene for any of us. We are working in pretty raw studio spaces.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Jim Green

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : July 5, 1988

PLACE : DERA Offices

- If we look at the Downtown Eastside, particularly in terms of development in the last 15 years, I would say the major thing that has happened is we see now a lot more of a stable, more moderate housing stock than we had before. In addition, we've seen a lot of services and amenities grow up in the neighbourhood. The major one is Carnegie Centre and then Crab Park, the upgrading of Oppenheimer Park, and the elimination of the Hastings Liquor Store. I think that one of the major things in both the eyes of the population at large and also the consciousness of the Downtown Eastside people is that they feel more political spirit here. People believe that those are victories (housing and Carnegie Centre and Crab Beach and things like that), and that they are quite capable of altering their reality for the better. So overall, I think that we've seen an aggressive march to the betterment of this community.

- Now we have had some major negative effects on the community and a lot of it has stemmed from development pressures, a lot of it came from the announcement of B.C. Place in 1980 and the loss between 1980 and 1986 of 2000 residential units that were demolished for parking lots or luxury apartments or commercial use around the perimeter of the B.C. Place site. And then, of course, we had the Expo evictions also where we had hundreds or maybe a thousand people evicted from their homes which caused a major disruption of the pattern of life in our community. So I think the displacement thing has been one of the major negative aspects, if not I would say the major aspect.

- The other thing that has happended in the last 15 years that is reversing a trend that probably started about 15-20 years ago and the trend was, at that time, to consciously remove families from the area and to set this... up as a place for elderly, disabled people with institutional needs. It would become sort of the spot in British Columbia to put people with certain kinds of problems. There has been a conscious effort now to bring families back in, to re-integrate families into the community. Some of the things that have helped us a heck of a lot on that, would be the DEOD, the zoning that is in there and the assistance of the City, Social Planning in particular, in assisting us with those goals to re-integrate the families back in. I'm not opposed to bringing in the seniors' housing, but I don't like the idea of removing the

families in order to do it. The magnitude of that, I don't think anyone understands what it was, how many single-family dwellings are gone now that were here 15 or 20 years ago. That trend is now being reversed which then leads us to problems with trying to get some of the support services for families in place which we are lacking.

- o I think that it gets more complicated as we look at the fact that the social housing programs have changed. The new program is diminishing the speed at which that trend was being reversed. Nobody wants to build co-op housing down here because you cannot get enough low-income people into it, and then co-op housing actually acts as agent for gentrification, so we do not co-op any more at all. We don't mind at all in the Downtown-Eastside, having people from the higher income bracket move in as long as they are kind of a pyramid, and our people are the greatest number, the low income people from here. I think in many ways it is good to bring in people that have a higher income. Sometimes they introduce people in their co-ops to a new job situation they didn't know about, or share their skills. They can be quite helpful in the community, but not if they come in in droves and start doing things like taking over the Board of Carnegie Centre and then saying, for instance, "Gee, all these people sit around playing chess and it would make a great squash court".

- o The more the area is improved, cleaned up, the more you get a community spirit, the better small business is going to do. Lots of the Japanese merchants are coming back into the area that haven't been here for years and years. A lot of the merchants are really improving. The people feel safer coming into the neighbourhood, because the neighbourhood is definitely safer, the crime rate has gone down as a result of social housing, and the more community consciousness, and eliminating the liquor store. It's glorious in many ways what has happened here. This community has really been quite successful in stopping gentrification.

- o But now if we look at the future, of course the major problem is going to be the cost of land and land value going up in the community. We're right now in this little thin peninsula. We're being in a pincher between Marathon Realty Development and Pacific Place Development on the other side.

- o Major things happening include the development of the two mega projects plus spin off developments around it that will try to get involved in that kind of similar activity. Also, the location of the SFU campus downtown - 7000 students. We have a new luxury hotel coming in the old Toronto Dominion Temple Bank. Those two developments together will alter that part of our community

drastically. The students are going to be looking for housing. We're going to see a tremendous amount of pressure on the existing housing stock. We see very little replacement in social housing. I think that what we're going to see a whole lot of in the next 10 to 15 years is displacement of the existing community, and it is going to be replaced by a more affluent group of people.

I think we're going to see a city that in its core is going to be non-families or very, very few, and very few low income people. I think that we're going to see some disasters: some developments that are going to start and not be completed and then we're going to have some like the old MURB holes. We already have a glut in office space which then leads to scratching for tenants, which means that other areas of the city will lose tenants and we'll see blights starting there as buildings are not occupied by the type of groups that were before. So on the periphery of the city, we're going to see a lot of changes. I think we're going to get some areas in the city that will be highly developed for commercial/residential use but without the residential backup necessary to make a city workable - a 24-hour city; a city which is segmented in between residential and office commercial which, in my opinion, doesn't work and leads to a hell of a lot of problems, including severe increase in crime, and a city that's not that happy a place to be, not very vibrant, or maybe too vibrant, or maybe too vibrant in parts of the day and dead at other parts of the day or night.

- I think we're going to look at definitely, no matter what way we go, a tremendous problem in terms of vehicular traffic. Even if we require X number of parking stalls per square foot of office tower, those cars have still got to get in and out of there, right, and that leads to a whole lot of problems that we see here every day. We know what the first demand is when you have a traffic problem is to bring in freeways, and if there is anything that destroys the livability of the downtown core of a city it's freeways, and especially elevated and trenched freeways.

- I think that one of the concerns is how is the social housing at B.C. Place is to be financed? If it's from the normal proposal calls, it will mean that they will be taking units away from the Downtown South, so instead of us getting a victory, we could actually end up with quite a defeat. Maybe they'll be put in on the west side where none of our people want to live.

- On the other hand now, things could be a lot better if we could envision a city that has the relatively high density in the downtown area where you do have a mix of residential and commerce in communities and you will have a place for families and there is nothing in my mind that says that a downtown area is not a good place for families. How you achieve this more vibrant and alive and

liveable city is something I'm not certain of because it takes a whole combination of factors, political will being a major one, the ability to use the City's powers, for instance, zoning. The heritage component of that also is very important.

- We're going to see tremendous destruction of the heritage that we do have. What little we hav left is totally endangered. An argument might be, for instance, the Georgia Medical Building, that the proposed new building is superior to the older so-called heritage building, and I would argue that that may be true in terms of design and materials and planning. But we have three billion dollars worth of development that we know is coming in now on basically vacant land where we can build all of the state-of-the-art 1990 architectural beauties that we would ever want to have. But we can't replace things like the Georgia Medical Building.

- (Interviewer's question: With so many new communities opening up for development, like Pacific Place and the Downtown South, one of the "plusses" for this seems that, if there were new areas for development maybe it would help relieve the pressure from existing areas. But the other side of the coin could be that the new development nearby would only increase the attractiveness of existing areas. So we have been starting to wonder which is the side of the coin most likely to happen).

  I think the answer can be either or both. Buying property down here for social housing was real easy, say in 1981, 1982, 1983, then it got harder and harder, and with this last proposal call in 1988, it was just about impossible. We also notice now that Lafarge Cement is for sale, right? I understand that the development that was proposed for the SkyTrain Terminal at Main and Terminal is coming back for another shot. We're going to have people who say, "Well, I didn't get into that pot, but look right next to it, and maybe with this particular site it's a little bit cheaper and has already got the zoning that I need so I can probably even get a tower in there before Mr. Li does." I believe very strongly that Vancouver has now been picked by the eastern big-boys as a place for buying property.

- What we need is something that we were just talking about before you came in, which is in San Francisco - a replacement by-law where when you tear down units, you eventually have to replace them. We need a whole lot of different kinds of legislation eventually in terms of coverage by the Residential Tenancy Act. Zoning I think is the biggest factor in saving this community and improving it. It just seems to me that this is the time because the uptake for B.C. Place and Marathon is going to be slow and then you're going to have Downtown South coming in. We have an opportunity to take this as an enclave and put in that kind of replacement zoning. I think it would be perfect. Also we've got so much heritage value here. We need to protect both the people that live here, the use of the building, and also the buildings themselves.

Jim Green

- We're not as skeptical of high density as other people are. If we are going to be a "world class city" and those things, and have a much higher population in the next few years, we're going to have a start acting more urban and I'm not sure that that requires a lot of sacrifices, if we have certain principles established. It's, you know, about livability and about the uses and the mixtures of families, etc. I don't see why it can't be done right. There are creative ways of dealing with space and you can actually make it a hell of a lot better. I would much rather my kid play basketball on the roof of a school in New York than play hockey in the lane in Vancouver.

- (Interviewer's question: High density is often accused, especially in the moderate-low income areas as "warehousing" people.)

  Yes, that's correct. Look at McLean and Raymur. For God's sake, that's not warehousing, that's dry docking people. They're in the middle of nowhere. It's the placement of it.

- The Four Sisters was just something that was an opportunity...it was kind of an instant laboratory for our ideals.

- Look at Scotia Tower. There's no component for residential around it. I think a lot of the problems with that Granville Mall thing has very little to do with the transit mall and has a lot to do with the fact that you don't have a lot of people living there.

- (Interviewer's question: You're saying that high density can be quite feasible and creates a perfectly good environment as long as you have the amenities that go with it.)

  I think so.

- Also, you have another problem with Raymur that you have with all one type of people living together, most of whom have very little chance of getting out of the poverty that they're in. It leads to the feeling of desperation. I think that a mix in incomes also helps alleviate those kinds of things. We did a study down here of what type of housing people want to live in. We interviewed 850 people and what came through over and over again was that people didn't want to live in anything that was identified as welfare housing. That's why we need a different type of housing program that does allow for integration of different types of people and different incomes.

o (Interviewer's question: Does the non-profit rental program get perceived as welfare housing?)

Well, it depends. I think in some cases, yes, but in our case, not really. Like our project across the street on East Hastings. You couldn't ask for anything that's more popular. First of all, because of where the building is. It's exactly where people want to live. It's one block from Woodward's, it's a block from Carnegie, the DERA office is across the street, every bus stops here. They also like that it's high density. They like it because it was the old City Hall. And they like it because the IWA used to have its office in there for 40 years. And they like it because Harry Rankin's office was in there and they remember going to see Harry. And they like the fact that we brought it back instead of tearing it down and it improved the community. And they like to watch the street. They like the security of it. They like the fact that they have a tenants' committee. And a security committee, and a social committee. And a place to hang out downstairs and drink coffee and bullshit. And they like having a library there.

o In our social housing project, people took the bachelor units over the one-bedrooms specifically because of views. That view factor in other cities in Canada, they've never experienced anything like it. So I think we really have to keep in mind, especially if we're going to get higher density, we've got to maintain those views. That's one of the things that really is essential to people in Vancouver. That's what many people like, but I don't think it can replace the natural beauty of this part of British Columbia.

o (Interviewer's question: How can we satisfy that need to house low income Downtown South people who would otherwise be displaced?)

I think it depends on several things. If low income or elderly, single, disabled people living there now are ghettoized or appear to be ghettoized, even though their housing might be okay but it's separate, it's seen as different from the rest of the community that's going up, and then I think you're getting into major problems. The other factor is in phasing it. Our people need to be established there to feel comfortable before newcomers and all take over. A lot of those people are permanent in their residential style. I was amazed when the Blackstone, remember?, evicted everyone. You had people in there 45 and 50 years. And where did they move? They moved across the street. We tried to get some of them down here, but oh no, they want to stay put. We consider that Downtown Eastside, too, that area. However, we have almost no contact with them unless there is a crisis.

Jim Green

- In building housing down here, I've said views are the most important factor. That's after the actual siting of the project. The most important factor is closeness to Woodward's. If Woodward's closed, it would be a big disaster. It would really screw things up down here. It is really THE point. They cash cheques for people, for pensions, people on GAIN, there's no charge. There's a post office in there, all kinds of things that people want in there.

- I don't know how far you can carry zoning without going to court a hundred times. Like in Gastown. Gastown is a great laboratory for studying the urban scene but then it's pretty much a complete failure. And look at some of the reasons why. Again, you had a lot of people that were living there who were displaced when Gastown came into place. We've got 57 t-shirt stores, is that right? Something like that. There's basically no grocery shopping.

- There is another one of my pet ones, this building across the street, you know, the old tram station at Hastings and Carrall. Simons Engineering now has it. They're working on the facade now, replacing bricks that have come off and cracked. Could you imagine the mixed residential commercial office - like a market on the ground floor - you could have, not as large a street market as Seattle, but you could have a great fisherman's outlet and stuff like that, and people who live upstairs could shop downstairs - incredible. Your doctor's office could be on the second floor.

- Savannah'. I just read an article in Heritage Conservation about downtown Savannah. They've got a lot of single-family dwellings and duplexes and sometimes larger stuff, and they're bringing it back for very low income people. The people have been involved in it, and the most amazing thing is it's done by a private developers and he's done something like $50 million worth now and he's used all these different tricks from their heritage trust. I'd like to find out more about what they're doing in Savannah.

- Michael Geller's argument has been, at least recently, that the housing that DERA has built is too good. Therefore, if we made smaller units, not as well designed and lesser materials, that we would save money and therefore we could build more units. It doesn't hold water. If you see one project that's kind of crappy built with the same government program and another project next door, same program, that is well designed, has good materials, etc., you're going to find that somebody worked really hard to make sure they got everything in that project they were supposed to get. Another thing that happens is that if you build a project that, let's say, is barely liveable, and that's it, often times people don't take a lot of pride in it. It's not attractive. It's hard to maintain. The place gets a bad reputation. You get worse and worse

tenants. The answer is to build stuff that people take pride in so that they'll protect it. It is definitely more cost effective on every level to build good social housing. There's no question that it cuts down on crime and other types of social problems.

- Across the street was the first non-profit, rental project sponsored by DERA (as opposed to co-op), and I was terrified that we would end up like landlord-tenant, but we got staff in there who are really into development of people, so basically the staff now are people who assist the tenants. I've got more involvement there than I do in a co-op. So it can happen without the co-op structure.

- The vast majority of cases of people who move into our projects don't necessarily quit drinking but they get a much better control of it. I don't think it's conscious. They get involved in the gardening committee, they've got a decent place, and they have friends over. They don't have to eat in the pub, they don't have to be ashamed, their families start visiting them that maybe haven't visited them in ten years because they didn't want to bring them into a little hotel room with one little bed and one chair. There is a very small segment, however, and it's very small, but about 5%, that maybe have had pretty much control over their drinking and within a few days of being in a project they're almost totally drunk, the worse they've probably ever been in their lives. They think perhaps there's too much expected of them now. It happens, and the only thing I could think is that there's just too much pressure somehow, but once they get over that they're usually okay.

- I foresee a lot of problems with a mix of students in this area. One of the hostilities that would grow up is if students start taking over rooming houses. Anything that starts displacing our people...It's certainly happening in places like Kitsilano where students, 8 or 10 students, get together and rent a single-family house. I think SFU has started off really badly by not talking to anybody and serving this community. If it is primarily business and people going back to upgrading and stuff, it may not affect the housing. Still, it would be nice if they would have some programs for the community. Look how successful everything is at Carnegie in terms of education. Look at the turnover of books in this library. It's amazing.

- (Interviewer's question: A real problem or challenge for this community is to maintain that balance because you were saying they don't mind having higher income people, provided there are not so many that they overwhelm and outnumber existing residents. I guess it requires continual monitoring and adjusting.)

Jim Green

It definitely does. There has been a series of articles actually written by a guy over here, John Chalmers, I think his name is. He's been in the Carnegie Press, you know, the Carnegie newsletter. I was so impressed with this guy's ability to understand all the pressures that are taking place. People here know what can happen; they know that all the guarantees that nobody will be evicted, all of that stuff we heard for a year and a half or two years before-hand. They don't trust anyone; they've seen it.

- Walk down this street... there's not a tree on these two blocks of Hastings, right?, there not one tree. When it's a hot day, especially on the north side of the street, it's blinding. You can't see, and there's no shade, no coolness, no green, nothing. Landscaping is a big, big issue. And more park space is very important.

- Weather protection can be yes, or no. If you have glass, you get pigeon shit all over it and you have to clean it all the time. If it's cloth, pigeon shit eats through it, and we've got lots of pigeons. It gets ripped and is hard to maintain. We don't want anything that has to be replaced. And a more major factor is a concern about it being used as a place where you have cooking wine parties, where you could stand out underneath it, drink, stay dry, go to the store, and get more cooking wine etc. Setbacks and covered areas are deadly.

- The other thing about the mega projects in terms of our future is how their edges meet the edges of existing communities and have we integrated them or not integrated them. There are several scenarios we can see there. For instance: One of the things they're talking about for Pacific Place is somewhere we're going to have to have a school. A school would be really important for developing family projects in this area. So, part of services and amenities that they apply there (Pacific Place) should be based just on their needs, but also on the needs of the rest of the community. Are we going to have an artificial self-contained community there with no integration to the rest? Or is there going to be a flow back and forth?

- The other thing is designing for the interactions. There is one place where, I think, McLean Park beats the hell out of Maldan Co-op. The way that McLean Park is laid out, you have sort of a big square in between the houses with some crappy play equipment there and lots of grass and mud and stuff. The way that Maldan is laid out is that each unit has an individual courtyard with an 8 foot wall around it. It works so well that there is very little interaction among the kids in the project.

Jim Green

- o B.C. Housing in many respects is easier to work with than CMHC, maybe because they're smaller and they're here. They've bent over backwards to assist us with a lot of the special problems. Social Planning, whom we deal with most of the time, is excellent.

- o What I'm really pressing for is to do some more heritage renovation stuff and that's where we're going to need money from the City and probably from Heritage Trust. That way we know it will be here and it will be housing people from the area.

- o (Interviewer's question: Is it harder when you're doing heritage buildings, to do it for families with children?)

  In this area I would say so, yes. In general, yes.

- o I look forward to an influx of more urban people into Vancouver because I think we're going to need that kind of expertise and knowledge that in many respects we're lacking. One of the things that has saved us from gentrification had nothing to do with DERA. The people in Vancouver aren't yet urbanized enough that they want to live here. That's all going to come. We're going to have to become more urban, one way or the other. Downtown Eastside is urban. People in Chinatown are urban. That's about it. The rest of the city is still pretty suburban.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Barbara Lindsay

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : September 9, 1988

PLACE : City Hall

- In terms of what I see having changed in the last fifteen years, obviously the downtown has gone through major changes. I see positive and I see negative. Positive things, that spring to mind are places like Robson Square that have a lot of open public space that is accessible to people. Negative, I see projects like Pacific Centre, with the malls that are very inaccessible and lacking in that sort of publicness. Another negative for me is the taking away of some of our heritage buildings in the downtown. Then on the positive side are some of the newer projects like the Bank of B.C. that does have an amenity, a public amenity in it. But it is not accessible which is a negative. Also, we really have to hold on to those last little views that we have got. People are concerned about that.

- Some of the more livable aspects of the downtown are the things that I would like to see more done. Public places that people can use that are accessible to all kinds of people. Those kinds of things, I think we need to work harder on. We are young. We are starting out and it is hard, you lose sight of that and as long as we don't lose what we have already got, we can keep building on that. Housing the downtown is really a key missing ingredient. I think if we don't build on our housing and our cultural and our retail and just leave it as an office area we are going to miss out on that, that livability.

- It is not just the housing, we have got to have the services that go with it, the community services. It is one thing to talk about housing and the density for families and should it be on the lagoons or should it not. But if you don't have the community services there and that mix of uses then I think that is really a failure. You need schools, you need the parks, the services, to give it a sense of community.

Barbara Lindsay

- People think "How can families live in high rises?" But I don't think we have to think of them as high rises. I could see on the Marathon property terraces with parks on the roofs within access of families and children. I think people, families, would live in the downtown with those kinds of family amenities there, not just amenities but services. I think we have to build that into the downtown. I think we have to think of it as a mix of people and a mix of housing types.

- That all has to be there. I don't necessarily agree with thinking families wouldn't live in parts of downtown, or people with children wouldn't live there. That is tending to almost ghettoize certain areas of the city. I am thinking of the Manhattan apartments, right in an urban area, that are full of families with children. And one reason they leave is because they don't have outdoor places. It is an experience and a way of life that a lot of families might choose if they have that option.

  Think of the advantages of living downtown and working downtown and being able to have your childcare downtown too. That is very attractive. Certainly one of the big arguments for being able to have housing for families with children close to downtown is if you are a single parent, there is no way you can get to and from the suburbs and still arrange your childcare.

- I feel that the downtown should be accessible to all spectrums of the population, all cross sections of people. It shouldn't be just expensive housing or just housing for single mothers. I think we really need to think about the spectrum of the population and to provide for that.

- (Interviewer's question: In areas that are yet to be developed, what would be the best for families with children?)

  For me the North Shore of False Creek just jumps right out. Also, Marathon, Coal Harbour. It's so close to Stanley Park. In many ways it is ideal. Transportation, the West End schools, the West End Community Centre. All of that is right there. It just is a shame to not do it when there is such a need.

- When we did our "Y" studies, we found the need for housing for women, and women with children, is just so critical. It is the women that are in need of housing.

Barbara Lindsay

- I don't think that high density is a problem. It is the other things that have to go with it - the services. I don't have a problem with high density myself.

- (Interviewer's question: Has the "Y" got into the question of the need for childcare in the downtown?)

  Yes, and in fact, we are doing some work in that area. We have had developers come to us recently and have asked how can they do it; is there a demand for it; what is involved? Those studies are just being done now.

- The group that you could call mature women, 45 to 60 years of age, is an area that has some real needs that have not been identified and addressed. Social isolation is a real problem for that age group. They are single or they may be widowed. We at the YWCA are concerned about housing for older women - older, single women in particular; that age group from 45 to say 55 - before they can get into housing for seniors. It is really missing.

- We also realized that there was a real need for emergency housing for women. The other area was to have a hotel, not a high price hotel, but one accessible to women who are travelling and that we felt was more appropriate in the downtown but some of those other forms of housing didn't necessarily have to be in the downtown. Another area that we work in is the whole international area of immigrants, refugees. We provide some housing for refugees in our hotel and residence.

- There is a need for housing for the ex-psychiatric people, which is a real need in this city. Crises housing: there is a real need for that. We can't provide that in our existing hotel and residence; it just doesn't work. So eventually we do really hope to have a residence that is a separate entity where we can have a range of housing. There is a model for that: the Toronto YWCA has received Provincial funding to do one. There would be support services in this type of residence.

- People have to have that equal opportunity to be downtown. The Bank of B.C. is an example of such inaccessibility which is unfortunate, because they provide a public amenity. And I'm sure that was part of their bonusing. And it's not accessible, whereas Robson Square is. Crab Park was also certainly unfortunate, that it wasn't more accessible. I'm think of public access in a number of ways. It's so important.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Rita Morin

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : August 17, 1988

PLACE : Office of Hay Career Consultants
1750 - 1140 West Pender Street

---

o (Interviewer's question: Are we going to lose a lot of women's jobs?)

I think there are other jobs that are rapidly taking their place that are also "women's" (unfortunately being termed "women's jobs") but, I don't think we're actually going to lose that many jobs, when you look at the trends. The reality is, the jobs are increasing in the service sector. So we're losing them in some categories, but we're picking them up in others, very dramatically. I don't see that much change.

o (Interviewer's question: This is a very safe city for women, I mean it's probably the safest in the world...?)

It is, and yet, the biggest problem for older women is not wanting to come out in the evening. It obviously is something that older women feel. At the "Y", we're only beginning to move into programming for the older woman. We've focussed on the single-mother, the teenager, the working woman, the disadvantaged. But we've never really focussed on the older woman. Last year we held our first weekend seminar for the older woman, just trying to build on what are the issues, what are the concerns, what are the problems, what can we as an organization do from a programming perspective. We're following that up with another weekend seminar this year. The other issue is: we (the YWCA) have one location, it's downtown, and that presents some problems for that particular age-group of women, who say "I'm not coming downtown; either I work downtown and that's fine, but if I need to come down in the evening, I'd think twice about it." If you talk to older people, older women in particular, that will be an issue for them, the safety factor in the evenings in the downtown core of the city.

o I also think a lot of the safety issue is a perception. The downtown core at the end of the work day looks empty, and therefore it says "unsafe". There are no people around and I think that it is

as much a perception issue as anything else. Who wants to come downtown at night particularly in the winter when there is no one else around. I think that it is very definitely an issue: what is happening in the downtown core at night after the offices are closed.

- The "YW" fortunately is on a fairly busy corner but there is still an issue about where you park. Most of the downtown lots don't have much action and that again presents a fear issue. Some of the parking lots responded quickly to an incident a few years ago by saying, if there is a woman coming into the parking lot at night, come and see the attendant and he will take you down to your car. In one way I thought, "well that's nice that they responded" and in another way I got really angry, thinking this is ridiculous. Why do I have to do this? How safe are they really?

- The other issue that is a major concern, a trend certainly in other cities and in this one as well, is the isolation of the older women and that to me is one of the biggest issues we need to address as a city. So many of them are widows, and end up living on their own, they end up relatively comfortable but isolated.

- I really believe that somehow in this city we have to create more housing in the downtown core. I think that is vital. I think we are crazy not to. If you look at what is going to happen population-wise, all the numbers, statistics, show the population in the Greater Vancouver area is going to continue to increase. Where the heck are we going to put them? So to me one of the natural solutions is to incorporate more housing in the downtown core. It's like the schools; they only get used during the day and here are these great building and what happens at night. Can't we make better use of what we've got. To me one of the natural things to do would be to ensure that there is more housing in the downtown core for all levels of people so that in fact we start to see the city stay alive into the evening because people live in the downtown core as well as work there.

- I don't believe that we should segregate people. What are we going to do? Make the downtown core for seniors only? Or make it for yuppies only? I think the whole flavour of the environment is enhanced when you have children, when you have seniors, when you have every level of person mixed into a community as much as you possibly can. I think it will only enhance what we have. I would hate to see it segregated into certain areas. I think it almost has to be public policy. If it doesn't come down to public policy, developers find ways not to do it and that bothers me because that is when we don't have it happen.

Rita Morin

- I don't believe that an executive women's club is a necessity in this city, I was involved in the groups in the early eighties who really attempted to make one happen here. I think there are many factors. I think it's partly Vancouver, but it's also where society is in total. I just don't believe that a professional woman needs a professional women's club. We can go anywhere we want in this city.

  An organization that doesn't accept women deserves to be in the 1800's which is about where they are. That day is so far past that I don't believe that women need a separate club to belong to. We need women's groups where we can collectively sit down as businesswomen and talk over issues. We have facilities to do that. I think the other issue is that I would choose to put my money elsewhere than into building a club.

- The downtown YWCA is used in the evening because people will stay after work to go to fitness classes. It is not used very much on the weekend, even though we do have classes available, but again because most people who use it work down here; they don't live down here.

- Granny Y's was converted from emergency childcare to infant and toddler childcare a number of years ago, a board decision, a financial decision. We now look at Granny Y's as being the "Upper Canada College" of Vancouver. We have a waiting list for parents who have yet to have children to get them into Granny Y's. The waiting list is a mile long. Basically it is people who work downtown, but we are also the only licensed infant daycare facility in Vancouver.

- The problem is that there is such an inequity in childcare from one province to another. For an example, in Ontario a couple earning $40,000 a year with a child get subsidized childcare. In Vancouver a couple earning more than $24,000 a year do not get subsidized childcare. The inequities are horrendous. We charge $650 a month for infant daycare and we have a waiting list. Even at that, it operates at a deficit. You cannot make childcare pay in the province of B.C. because of the rules and regulations. You look at childcare workers, traditionally women, traditionally a ghetto field for women and the pay is low. And we still can't make that break even. We as a board have made a decision to keep running it because we know it is a model for the community.

Rita Morin

- If a woman could pursue her career and know that there was no doubt - that she could have her child close-by and that it wasn't going to cost her her paycheque - then my guess is that we probably would see an increased birth rate, and I think as well we would probably see parents with one child having more than one, if that were an option for them.

- Portal Park is really working. It is pretty and so pleasant. You look at all the concrete and glass around you and all of sudden here is this beautiful little patch of green with a great view. The other one is the Sky Train corner (Discovery Square) which is also well used. You often see people lying on the grass eating their lunch. I think as we build more towers we need open space to be able to come out to. It is the same when you walk outside of 666 Burrard Street now (Park Place). That park is well used. You get away from the cement and away from all the hard edges just to see a patch of green. I think it is really important to have that in the downtown core of a city.

- The only other issue associated with childcare centres which is absolutely major is a dropoff point. Traffic is a nightmare. What are you going to do? You can't stop on Burrard at 6:00 to pick up your child or on Pender because there is no stopping. So you've got to have a place where the people can stop to drop their children off. It takes a bit longer than picking up an adult and dropping them off. You need something to allow that.

- I look at SFU now moving downtown, what that starts to do to people wanting to be involved and to be able to upgrade their education. It is such a plus to have it move downtown that to me that kind of facility begs to have people living nearby.

- I guess the other major issue that I see in the downtown core with all the development is the issue of parking. We are not going to do away with the car. That's the biggest nightmare and it is for everybody but it is important for parking to be planned into any new development.

HIGHLIGHTS

INTERVIEW: Former Chief Justice Nathan Nemetz

WITH : Joyce Catliff and Ronda Howard

DATE : October 18, 1988

PLACE : Robson Court Office Building, Howe Street

(Note: The tape recorder did not record this interview clearly enough for a full transcript; this summary is based on the tape and the interviewers' notes).

- Mr. Justice Nemetz reflected on the past when Vancouver was much smaller than it is now. Noting that the past had its positive aspects, he went on to say he is not nostalgic for the past, but instead looks to the future. We must face the fact of the Pacific Rim. Vancouver's growth is automatic, bringing physical and sociological changes.

- The impacts of growth are similar here to other, comparable, cities; for example, heritage and view preservation issues.

- Views from downtown buildings outward to the north shore are important. Also important is the entrance to the city as viewed from the port. Street end views are another aspect. The rationalizing and positioning of buildings is thus a key issue.

- Transportation brings another set of issues, including access to the north shore. Also, downtown traffic congestion is frustrating, especially from Thurlow to Howe on Georgia. These issues must be looked at. If problems are left to irritate people, eventually immediate solutions are put in place which are not fully thought out. Instead, the City needs to move ahead of time, to plan. Mr. Nemetz said we are fortunate not to have put freeways in our city. He noted that in some cities, cars are not permitted in the downtown core.

- Downtown transit is also a good idea. Mr. Nemetz recalled the Broadway to Hastings belt line of 40 years ago: the #1 Fairview Line.

- Mr. Nemetz spoke of the fight against a sixty-storey office tower for Robson Square. He said it is important that the law courts are kept physically and symbolically separate and independent from government offices. He noted how important Robson Square has become for the space created in the centre of the city. He has envisioned extending this open space south to Davie Street or farther.

Former Chief Justice Nathan Nemetz

- The Coal Harbour plans provide the opportunity for an entrance to the downtown and for a people place, including strolling from the cruise ships to Stanley Park.

- Housing is important downtown so that the area is not empty at night. The area to the east of Granville should have housing. Something needs to be done about the prostitutes. For high density housing, greenery is needed. Mr. Nemetz recalled visiting in Sweden a housing project which mixed retired people and families with children, to the benefit of both groups.

- Vancouver's amenity can attract footloose industries, but it doesn't always work. It didn't work for U.B.C. It might have been successful if there had been more effort by the University. As chancellor of U.B.C. he worked hard on this.

- We have very little public art. More is needed.

- A citizens advisory commission like the Planning Commission is a very important aspect of the planning process.

- In conclusion, the City has to be careful not to make irretrievable errors. Constant surveillance with authority is necessary.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Interviews were conducted by:

Ronda Howard, Senior Planner, Central Area Division, Planning Department

Joyce Catliff, Executive Co-ordinator, City Planning Commission

With assistance from:

Larry Simmons, Planning Assistant, Central Area Division - scheduling and co-ordination

Andree Bolger, Acting Clerk to the City Planning Commission - interview transcriptions

City of Vancouver
Planning Department
R.J. Spaxman
Director of Planning

Vancouver City Planning
Commission (VCPC)
Kerry-Lynne D. Ferris
Chairman